

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



## **The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church**

### **Tracing the development of the Trinitarian theology of the Holy Spirit in the years 358 to 378 CE**

Cann, David Lee

*Awarding institution:*  
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

#### **END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church:  
Tracing the development of the Trinitarian  
theology of the Holy Spirit  
in the years 358 to 378 CE

by

David L. Cann

Submitted for the Degree of Master of Philosophy

Department of Theology and Religious Studies

School of Arts and Sciences

King's College London

Trinity 2014

## ***Abstract***

Studies of the patristic literature regarding the Holy Spirit have offered insights into the emergence of doctrine, but leave the flow of ideas amongst fourth-century writers somewhat vague and in need of further study. This project examines in detail the development of doctrine of the Holy Spirit between the years 358 and 378 CE - a pivotal time in the history of the Church for establishing doctrine on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. This study explores the late fourth-century discussion of the nature or personal being of the Holy Spirit, and asks: What were the key threads of discussion on the divinity of the Holy Spirit? How have these threads of discussion informed Christian thought in the late fourth century about the Holy Spirit? What use of ideas in common can be traced in the arguments of Athanasius with those of other colleagues, especially Apolinarius of Laodicea, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea? In 1989, Reinhard M Hübner provided a method for scholars to analyse fourth-century patristic literature and trace the flow of statements about the Holy Spirit. In 1996, Volker Henning Drecolli critiqued Hübner's method and findings. One outcome of reviewing the Hübner-Drecolli debate is recognising the need to adapt Hübner's method to make it more effective.

This study makes two significant changes to Hübner's method:

1. Extends the literature analysis beyond the proponents to include the *opponents* to a divine Holy Spirit, and
2. Shifts the focus from segmented phrases to whole theological ideas.

What emerges from employing this adaptation of Hübner's method is that the engagement between the proponents and opponents of a divine Holy Spirit stirred the Pro-Nicene writers to establish the *unity of substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity.

## ***Table of Contents***

Abstract .....	2
Abbreviations .....	4
Introduction.....	5
Chapter 1: The debate between Hübner and Drecoll .....	20
Hübner’s argument .....	20
Drecoll’s counter-argument .....	36
Topics not argued by Hübner and Drecoll.....	40
Chapter 2: The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Century .....	44
Asterius of Cappadocia.....	45
Marcellus of Ancyra.....	49
Eusebius of Caesarea.....	52
Pseudo-Athanasius .....	56
Apolinarius of Laodicea .....	65
Athanasius of Alexandria.....	66
Acacius of Caesarea .....	67
Basil of Caesarea.....	70
Descriptions of the Holy Spirit from the Years 358 to 378.....	76
Chapter 3: Athanasius’ Position in his Epistulae ad Serapionem .....	83
Chapter 4: Basil’s Position in his De Spiritu Sancto .....	121
Basil on the Holy Spirit in his De Spiritu Sancto .....	121
Basil and post-apostolic witnesses.....	152
Chapter 5: Re-assessing the Hübner/Drecoll-findings .....	161
Drecoll’s counter-argument .....	173
Topics not argued by Hübner and Drecoll.....	188
Further explorations.....	199
Bibliography.....	206
Primary Sources:.....	206
Secondary Sources: .....	208

***Abbreviations***

*Ep./Epp.*      *Epistula/Epistulae*

*H.E.*          *Historia Ecclesiastica*

*JTS*          *Journal of Theological Studies*

Fr.          Fragment(s)

*GPT*          *God in Patristic Thought*, Prestige, G. L.

*PG*          Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus completus Series Graeca*

*NPNF*<sup>2</sup>      *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, (ed.) Schaff, P.  
and Wace, H.

## ***Introduction***

With the specific themes identified which bear upon the late, fourth-century discussion of the nature or personal being of the Holy Spirit, the research questions for this project are formed. What were the key threads of discussion on the divinity of the Holy Spirit? How have these threads of discussion informed Christian thought in the late fourth century about the Holy Spirit? What use of ideas in common can be traced in the arguments of Athanasius with those of other colleagues, especially Apolinarius of Laodicea, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea? How did these threads of discussion develop in the years 358 to 378 CE? What do these contribute to the further definition of Constantinople in 381? What does the secondary literature have to say about this? What does this study suggest about how these threads developed?

This enquiry seeks to show that the searching exegetical approach of the pro-Nicene Trinitarian writers, Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea, according to a facile integration of the 'skopos' of Scripture that incorporated the received doxologies and liturgical formulae of the Church, taken together with their advancement of the technical language of Christian thought, account largely for the acceptance in the fourth-century of a fully divine Holy Spirit worthy to be worshipped by Christians as God. In addition to these achievements of fourth-century writers, this enquiry seeks to establish that the emerging consensus around a fully-divine Holy Spirit also must be due in appreciable extent to a presupposition amongst Christians that the Holy Spirit is divine.

Patristic scholars Reinhard M. Hübner and Volker Henning Drecolll detail and apply methods of analysing texts for connections. Then they trace the possible flow of ideas between protagonists in the late fourth-century treatises and letters on the divinity and being of the Holy Spirit. Informed by the work of Hübner and Drecolll, this project looks at the flow of theological ideas amongst both proponents and opponents and seeks to apply their methods or, where necessary, try others.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

At the beginning of this study, it is shown that Hübner's argument for the use of ideas in common between Pseudo-Athanasius (and Apolinarius) and both Athanasius and Basil bring him to a scenario where there seem to be clear instances of influence of Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius upon Basil and Athanasius. Drecoll challenges that scenario and puts forward his counter-argument for four others.<sup>1</sup>

An examination of Hübner's view of a movement of ideas from Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius outward reveals that he assumes the primacy of their theological ideas over those of Basil and Athanasius. Is his assumed primacy of their theological ideas supported in the examples he provides? A closer look at *Epistulae 361-364* between Basil and Apolinarius yields mixed results amongst modern scholars with regard to the authenticity of authorship and the order of the letters. Does Hübner find in these letters support for his view that Basil borrowed the Trinitarian ideas of Apolinarius?<sup>2</sup>

If *Epistulae 361-364* provide Hübner inadequate support on which to base his argument, is there yet value to be gained from Hübner's approach in relation to these letters? This enquiry begins from an adaptation of Hübner's approach with a shift in perspective. *Epistulae 361-364* call for a closer examination because they contain theological content that touches on the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit: the ideas of *identity of substance* in the Trinity and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup>

In view of this significant theological content, this project seeks to adapt Hübner's approach by moving the focus from the granular level of key phrases towards the identification of ideas. In the examination of *Epistulae 361-364*, it is beneficial to follow Hübner's guidance into the comparative analysis of *Epistulae 361-364*, but bring the focus towards two theological ideas of

---

<sup>1</sup> Drecoll, Volker H. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*. (Göttingen, 1996), 35-36.

<sup>2</sup> Hübner, Reinhard M., *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin: (Pseudo-Athanasius, contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* (Berlin, 1989), 250-251.

<sup>3</sup> Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London, 1956).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

particular interest in this survey which are discussed between Apolinarius and Basil: *identity of substance* in the Trinity and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.

With this shift in focus, this survey follows Hübner's lead into the text of *Epistulae 361-364* and finds other treasures than he found. For example, in *Epistula 361* Basil asks Apolinarius for clarification on the *homoousion*, revealing that while Basil embraced unity of substance between the Father and the Son he yet felt uncertainty over the term *homoousion*. Apolinarius answers Basil in *Epistula 362* with his definition of unity of substance:

He [the Son] is of-one-substance [*homoousion* with the Father] in a quite exclusive and individual sense; not like members of the same species or bits partitioned from the same lump, but as the one and only offspring from the single stock and 'pattern' of the deity, issuing in an inseparable and non-physical manner, in such wise that what begets continues to be its generative self [ἰδιότης] while issuing as a begotten self.<sup>4</sup>

So, with the focus of the search shifted from segmented phrases to theological ideas, this study finds in *Epistulae 361-362* one of the gems in the development of Church teaching on the Holy Spirit: *identity of substance* in the Trinity.

Continuing the search, this survey looks further into *Epistulae 361-364* and finds discussion of the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit. In *Epistula 364*, Apolinarius informs Basil that 'The subject of the Spirit was introduced at the same time [in a letter from Alexandria], to the effect that the fathers [who met at Alexandria] included him [the Holy Spirit] in the same confession as the Father and the Son, because he has his being in the same deity.'<sup>5</sup> Even though Apolinarius reports about and accepts the Holy Spirit being placed within the Holy Trinity, yet with a personal status subordinate to the Father and Son,<sup>6</sup> he provides to Basil confirmation of both the first and second of the key theological ideas:

1. The term *homoousion* is sound when applied to the idea of *identity of substance* with regards to the Father and Son, and also to the Holy Spirit;

---

<sup>4</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula 362*, in Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 43, note 1 ἵνα μή αὐτός ο πατήρ ἡ μέρος πατρός, αδυνατῶς, παρίσταται το ἄλλως υἱός.

<sup>5</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula 364*, in Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 45, note 5.

<sup>6</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula 364*, in Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 44-46.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

2. The Holy Spirit has come to be recognised by the Church as possessing the same *divinity* as the Father and the Son, yet subordinate to the Father and Son.

So, this enquiry searches *Epistulae 361-364* further for theological ideas and finds another gem in the development of Church teaching on the Holy Spirit: the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.

Basil, completing his transition from the homoiousian to the homoousian view, then went on to write in *Contra Eunomium III* that the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification is evidence of the Spirit's *divinity*.<sup>7</sup>

Continuing the search for theological ideas in Basil's writings, this study also considers the approach of Drecoll whose focus takes in these theological ideas. Drecoll recognises that Basil diverts from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification.<sup>8</sup> This survey examines how Basil challenged the Eunomian view of a difference in nature between the Father and the Son due to the Son's perceived emergence in time and creation, when he cited the numerous Bible attestations to God's being beyond time and creation and the Son's being the Word that was 'with God' and 'was God' (*John* 1:1) and to the Holy Spirit's possessing with the Father and the Son the same divine nature and engaging in the same deifying work.<sup>9</sup>

A possible turning point in Basil's view of divinity of the Holy Spirit is offered in *Epistula 364*. Apolinarius tells Basil that bishops had visited on their way from a synod in Egypt bearing a letter in support of the Nicæan definition and critical of the *homoiousion*. Prestige identifies that letter as Athanasius' reply to Emperor Jovian's letter granting him reinstatement as Bishop of Alexandria. In his letter of reply, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, Athanasius defends orthodox doctrine on the Holy Spirit:<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D.

<sup>8</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 138-140.

<sup>9</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D. Milton V. Anastos, 'Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίον, A Critical Analysis', in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, *Op. cit.*, 67-136.

<sup>10</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula 364*, in Prestige, *St Basil & Apollinaris*; 45, note 1. Athanasius, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4:567-568. Athanasius received a gracious letter of recall to his

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

...But since now certain who wish to renew the Arian heresy ...[are] explaining away the 'Coessential,' and blaspheming of their own accord against the Holy Spirit, in affirming that It is a creature, and came into being as a thing made by the Son'.

...For they [the fathers of Nicaea] have not merely said that the Son is like the Father, ...but they wrote 'Coessential,' which was peculiar to a genuine and true Son, truly and naturally from the Father. Nor yet did they make the Holy Spirit alien from the Father and the Son, but rather glorified Him together with the Father and the Son, in the one faith of the Holy Triad, because there is in the Holy Triad also one Godhead.

Also in *Epistula 364*, Apolinarius criticizes the attempt on the part of the opponents to discredit the *homoousion* and replace it with 'similar in substance' saying, 'The motive is to suggest a substance that bears the same sort of similarity that a statue might bear to the Emperor.'<sup>11</sup> Interestingly, and as Prestige has cited, Apolinarius employs the same illustration of 'statue' and 'Emperor' that Athanasius uses in *Orationes Contra Arianos*,<sup>12</sup> albeit in the opposite way. Apolinarius used the illustration of the statue and Emperor to show that the opponents to the *homoousion* present Christ as a *copy* of the Father. For Athanasius, the illustration of the image of the Emperor serves to show that 'Since the Son too is the Father's Image, it must necessarily be understood that the Godhead and propriety of the Father is the Being of the Son.'<sup>13</sup>

This enquiry recognises that Hübner has charted a promising course through the late fourth-century writings on the Holy Spirit, and follows his lead in searching Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos*; Basil's *Homilia XXIV, Contra Eunomium III, Epistula 361*, and *De Spiritu Sancto*; Apolinarius' *Epistulae 362* and *364* and Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* for significant theological ideas about the Holy Spirit. Hübner has chosen key phrases in texts as markers which, in his analysis, describe their direction of flow and emergence in time. In the case of 'divine ousia' Hübner draws upon *Epistulae 361-364* to support his view that 'hypostasis' is used by Apolinarius first in the sense of 'divine ousia'.

---

episcopal see at Alexandria [in the year 363] from the Emperor Jovian. In his letter of reply, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, Athanasius condemns those who deny the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>11</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula 364*; in Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 45, note 4.

<sup>12</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes Contra Arianos III*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:396.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

For Apolinarius ‘divine ousia’ is uniquely the property of the Father.<sup>14</sup> Hübner has placed the emergence in time of Apolinarius’ key phrase that describes the Son as ‘brightness of His (God’s) glory and extent of His hypostasis’ on *Hebrews* 1:3 to a two-year period from the Synod of Constantinople in 360 to no later than 362, when the Trinitarian key phrase ‘one *ousia* – three *hypostases*’ came into use (described in Athanasius’ letter *Tomus ad Antiochenos* written in 362).<sup>15</sup>

So this survey follows Hübner’s course across the writings of proponents for a divine Holy Spirit. Similarly, the texts Hübner has surveyed provide the way to proceed in pursuit of the emergence and flow of significant theological ideas that describe the Holy Spirit. The approach that this study takes to identify the markers for the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit diverges from that of Hübner in three ways. First, it draws upon the writings of the *opponents* as well as those of the proponents of a divine Holy Spirit. Second, it shifts focus away from the granular level of phrases towards formal statements of key theological ideas as markers. Especially important to this enquiry are the two key theological ideas: *unity of substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit. A third difference is that it seeks descriptions of presuppositions amongst Christian writers before the fourth century to gain a sense of the mind of the Church concerning the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

In Chapter 2, this approach applied to the early writings of Pseudo-Athanasius, Apolinarius, Basil, Athanasius and their opponents supposes that the initial tumult caused by the efforts of the Homoian semi-Arians at the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia in 358 to replace the statement of the ‘homoousion’ in the Nicene Creed with another creedal formula obscured a more subtle process that began with these opponents adding definition to statements on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. These opponents to the ‘homoousion’ had introduced formal descriptions drawn from Scripture of the Holy Spirit as ‘Comforter’ and ‘Spirit of truth’ (*John* 14:16-17, 15:26, 16:14). As the debate intensified, the contenders represented this time by Eleusius of Cyzicus (of the Homoiousion

---

<sup>14</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237.

<sup>15</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237; *Hebrews* 1:3; Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:481-486; *PG* 26:795-810.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

party) drew upon Scripture by way of the baptismal commission (*Matthew* 28:19) describing the activity of the Holy Spirit to include consolation, sanctification, and perfection. Those contending over the ‘homooousion’ put forward early definitions that presented the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, who participated in the Incarnation of the Son, Who as Son is the ‘image of the Divinity’. Alongside the pro-Nicene writers of the mid to late fourth century, Apolinarius of Laodicea included the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, with a status subordinate to the Son.<sup>16</sup> In *Contra Eunomium III* (written circa 364 or later), Basil of Caesarea argued that the Holy Spirit’s role in sanctification proves the Spirit’s divinity, and thus transited from the homoiousion view to the homooousion view.<sup>17</sup>

This survey searches Basil’s *Contra Eunomium III*, for markers of the two key theological ideas of *unity of divine substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit. In Basil’s point-by-point argument against Eunomius of Cyzicus over the nature and role of the Holy Spirit, Basil inserts fragments of Eunomius’s statements on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. The first fragment of Eunomius asserts that since the Son is the Only-begotten (subordinate to the Father and second in nature), so the Holy Spirit (subordinate to the Son) is third in dignity and order and as such third in nature.<sup>18</sup> Basil assails this idea as blasphemous, and questions Eunomius’s claim that it is based in the ‘teaching of the saints’ (*doxais, ten de tōn hagion*). Basil offers the first marker of *unity of divine substance* in the Trinity when he demonstrates that as the Son (even though He defers to the Father) is of the same divine nature as the Father, so the Holy Spirit (while in deference to the Son) is also of the same divine nature. Basil offers the next marker of the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit in an insightful line of reasoning supported by Scriptural texts, when he shows that the Holy Spirit’s full divinity is attested by these activities (*energeiai*) – imparting grace, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, power - which are uniquely of God.<sup>19</sup> Basil further attests to the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit when he contests Eunomius’s statement that the Holy Spirit is third in order and nature by command of the Father, is a work of the Son

---

<sup>16</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula* 362; Prestige, *St Basil & Apollinaris*, 39-43.

<sup>17</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 653A.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 661C-664B. *Matt.* 23:10; *John* 14:26; 1 *Cor.* 12.4-6:11.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Who created [the Spirit] to be third [in order and nature] and the first [and grandest] creation of the Only-begotten.<sup>20</sup> Basil, after condemning these words as blasphemous, describes with Scriptural texts more activities – abiding in believers and sanctifying them in baptism ‘in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit’ – that reveal the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.<sup>21</sup> Finally, Basil shifts the direction of his counter-argument to an exposition on the limits to the reach of human understanding, which concedes the Holy Spirit to be beyond our ken and above creation. Basil emphasizes that the Holy Spirit must be above creation (and of a higher nature) since that which sanctifies, teaches and reveals is of a nature other than that which receives sanctification, teaching and revelation.<sup>22</sup> In arguing thus, Basil foils Eunomius’s conclusion that [the Holy Spirit] is created, neither begotten nor unbegotten; only God is supreme (*anarchos*) and unbegotten (*agennetos*); therefore [the Holy Spirit] must be named a creation (*ktisma*) and a work (*poiema*).<sup>23</sup> Basil refutes Eunomius’s exegeses of two key Scriptural texts in support of his conclusion that the Holy Spirit is part of creation: Amos 4:13 and John 1:3. Eunomius put forward Amos 4:13 to show the Spirit (*pneuma*) to be created and John 1:3 to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is part of creation. Basil challenged Eunomius’s exegesis of Amos 4:13 on the basis of misreading and confusion of grammar by arguing first that ‘pneuma’ referred to ‘wind’ and not ‘Spirit’ and second that the meaning of the passage was of a continuous action (which recurs like weather) rather than a single act of creation that happened at a fixed point in time. Then Basil counters Eunomius’s exegesis of John 1:3 on the strength of the point already argued that the nature of the Holy Spirit is other than things created and so above creation.<sup>24</sup>

Eunomius put forward statements that denied both the unity of substance in the Trinity and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In his counter-argument, Basil composed statements that gave more shape and definition to the Church’s teaching in support of the two key theological ideas of *unity of divine substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 665A.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 665B-D. 1 *John* 3:24; 1 *Cor.* 3:16; *Eph.* 2:21, 22; *Matt.* 28:19.

<sup>22</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:665D-668C.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 665D-668A.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, PG 29:668D-669B; Amos 4:13; John 1:3.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In Chapter 3, this approach is applied to the writings of Athanasius and his contemporaries, beginning with a look at his *Tomus ad Antiochenos* in which Athanasius addresses the objections of Arian and semi-Arian opponents with an affirmation of the Nicene Creed and a condemnation of the doctrine that the ‘Holy Spirit is a Creature...separate from the Essence of Christ’.<sup>25</sup> When Athanasius was in his third exile (ca 362) he was asked by Bishop Serapion of Thmuis to write in contravention to those who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In his *Epistulae ad Serapionem*<sup>26</sup> Athanasius argues for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit as an ‘uncreated’ member of the Holy Trinity with the roles to give life, inspire prophecy, and act in concert with the Son to perfect and renew all things.<sup>27</sup>

While in Hübner’s discussion this content was compared with that of Basil of Caesarea’s *Homilia XXIV*, the key ideas on the Holy Spirit, which Hübner found in Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos*, can be compared readily with those in Athanasius’ *Epistulae ad Serapionem*.<sup>28</sup> This study notes the affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where Pseudo-Athanasius (Hübner’s ‘Apolinarius’) in *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. Further connections of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit continue from where Hübner found them in the Pseudo-Athanasian text of *Contra Sabellianos*.<sup>29</sup> In one instance, Pseudo-Athanasius in *Contra Sabellianos* and Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* can be said to connect in two ways around the idea of the unity of activity in the Trinity and the distinction of the Persons. Firstly, in support of the principle of the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. ‘This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one.’<sup>30</sup> Secondly, he distinguishes the Person of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. III*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:81-82.

<sup>26</sup> Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistulae ad Serapionem I-III*, in Shapland, *Op. cit.*; PG 26.

<sup>27</sup> *Epp. ad Serap. II-III.7*; Shapland, *Letters*, 162.

<sup>28</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 90-100, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>29</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>30</sup> *Ep. ad Serap. I:31*; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ’ ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστὶ. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ’ ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡται τῷ πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Holy Spirit, ‘The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.’<sup>31</sup> A comparison and analysis of Athanasius’ *Epistulae ad Serapionem* with Basil’s *Contra Eunomium III* adds detail with which to chart the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the writings of Athanasius, Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil. Both Athanasius and Basil argue for the divinity of the Holy Spirit on the basis that the Holy Spirit does what only God can do. Athanasius argues in *Epp. ad Serap.* that the Holy Spirit ‘in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things’ participates in the activity of the Godhead (on 2 *Cor.* 13:13). Basil proceeds to argue that the Holy Spirit participates in the active work (*energeia*) of God – the Holy Spirit is the ‘Spirit of adoption’ (on *Romans* 8:15), a Teacher (on *John* 14:26), a Bestower of grace (on 1 *Cor.* 12:4-6)<sup>32</sup> – and this demonstrates the Holy Spirit’s divinity of nature (*to theion tes physeos*).<sup>33</sup>

This survey follows Drecoll in his look at the theological ideas in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. Drecoll finds that Athanasius directs his lengthy argument from Christology only to those opponents to a divine Holy Spirit who were not

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>32</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661B-664B. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα τοιαῦτα τοῦ μεγαλείου τῆς φύσεως ἐνδεικτικά· αἱ δὲ ἐνέργειαι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος οἶαι; Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, φησὶν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν, καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν. Ὡς τοίνυν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος δημιουργός ἐστι τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ στερεὸν καὶ πάγιον τῆς ἀρετῆς παρέχεται ταῖς οὐρανίαις δυνάμεσι. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰώβ· Πνεῦμα Κυρίου τὸ ποιήσαν με· οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς δημιουργίας, ὥς οἶμαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ἀρετὴν τελειώσεως λέγων. Ὁ δὲ Ἡσαΐας ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου διαλεγόμενος, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ δηλονότι, Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με, φησὶ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ψαλμὸς, δι’ ὧν κεχωρηκέναι δύναμιν τοῦ Πνεύματος παριστάς, Ποῦ πορευθῶ, φησὶ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματός σου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω; Αἱ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ φθάνουσαι εὐεργεσίαι ὁποῖαι τινές εἰσι καὶ ἡλίκαι; Ὡς περ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν τοῖς δεξαμένοις αὐτὸν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον Πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας ἐστί. Καὶ ὥς περ διδάσκαλός ἐστιν ἀληθινός ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ καλέσατε διδάσκαλον ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εἷς γὰρ καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός· οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διδάσκειν πάντας τοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου πεπιστευκότας, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου μεμαρτύρηται, εἰπόντος· Ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ Πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα. Καὶ ὥς περ διαιρεῖν τὰ ἐνεργήματα εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους τῆς ὑποδοχῆς τῶν ἐνεργημάτων ὁ Πατήρ λέγεται, καὶ διαιρεῖν τὰς διακονίας ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τοῖς τῆς διακονίας ἀξιώμασιν· οὕτω διαιρεῖν καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους τῆς τῶν χαρισμάτων ὑποδοχῆς μαρτυρεῖται. Διαιρέσεις γὰρ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πανσιν.

<sup>33</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:664B. “Ὁρᾷς πῶς καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐνέργεια συντεταγμένη ἐστὶ τῇ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ ἐνεργεῖα; Εἶτα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπαγομένου μειζόνως τὸ θεῖον τῆς φύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φανεροῦται.”

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

influenced by neo-Arian ideas;<sup>34</sup> yet Drecoll does not offer a reason why Athanasius would have done so. In making this assumption about Athanasius' opponents, is it possible that Drecoll rules out promising reasons why Athanasius might have chosen to argue labouriously from Christology for the divinity of the Holy Spirit? To address this question, this study reviews the history of Athanasius' clashes with Arians in both Antioch and Alexandria.<sup>35</sup> Does this history support the idea that Athanasius felt the need in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* to underpin his argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit with a firm foundation in the unity of substance between the Father and the Son? Does this offer an explanation of why, in a treatise about the Holy Spirit, Athanasius argues from Christology in two thirds of the text, and then devotes the remaining third to the divinity of the Holy Spirit?

In Chapter 4, the later writings of Basil and his contemporaries are examined. The search for theological ideas in Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* also yields markers indicative of the mind of the Church on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. In his reach for authoritative evidence in support of his case for the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Basil drew from both Scripture and the 'unwritten' teaching of the forerunners and liturgical practices in the early Church, in particular the sacraments of baptism, anointing and Eucharist.<sup>36</sup> In doing so, Basil reminds his opponents that they have professed their faith and pledged themselves in service to a Church whose Scripture and tradition attest to the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit.<sup>37</sup>

Basil addressed his treatise primarily to a group of conservative bishops sympathetic to the views of Basil of Ancyra, who advanced an homoiousion, or 'similar in substance', description of the natures of the Father and the Son, which emphasised the Father's role as 'Father' to the Son.<sup>38</sup> Basil also addressed his treatise to the anhomoians and neo-Arians who professed no commonality of nature between the Father and the Son. In his rhetorical engagement with these

---

<sup>34</sup> Drecoll, *Op. cit.*, 138-140.

<sup>35</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 451-480.

<sup>36</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:200B-D). Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF<sup>2</sup> 8:45-47).

<sup>37</sup> J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, (London 1950/2008), 152-155.

<sup>38</sup> C. R. B. Shapland, *Introduction to The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (London 1951), 21-22.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

opponents, Basil kept to the emergent understanding amongst pro-Nicenes that divinity can be proven by way of the action, *energeia*, of God. Interestingly, the homoiousion argument offered the addition of proving divinity by describing the being, *to einai*, of God.<sup>39</sup> This use of ‘substance’ to describe divinity was then applied to the argument for the Holy Spirit. In their new appreciation for the shared divine nature of the Father and the Son, the conservatives distanced themselves from the neo-Arians and closed ranks with Athanasius of Alexandria and the pro-Nicene party. Athanasius with Basil of Caesarea and the pro-Nicenes came to describe the Holy Spirit in terms of both divine action and divine being.<sup>40</sup>

This enquiry looks at how Basil sought to extend his supporting text in *De Spiritu Sancto* to answer those amongst both the conservatives and neo-Arians who opposed the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit. In composing his treatise, Basil soon found that he needed to draw from both Scripture and tradition to support his argument for a fully-divine Holy Spirit. To present his evidence from unwritten teaching in a way that could not be dismissed easily as not Scriptural, he appealed to the sacraments. Basil drew support from writers in the first three centuries of the Church to describe their prayers to the Holy Spirit in a variety of observances and invocations such that even the conservatives could not quickly dismiss them for risk of losing their own credibility as clerics.

Basil’s argument is considered, in which he states that what has come to the Church “in a mystery” by way of the received doxologies and liturgical formulae were inspired by Scripture. In his assertion that both *dogma* and *kerygma* are valid responses to the Gospel and both have equal authority Basil seeks to extend the authority of Scripture to the teaching and practice of the Church.

To what extent did Basil successfully present the mind of the Church as having a presupposition that the Holy Spirit is divine, when he bases his argument for the

---

<sup>39</sup> R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy*, 318-381 (London 2005) 352-357. For a classic exploration of the meanings of *homoousios* see G. Christopher Stead’s paper “The Concept of Divine Substance” in *Vigiliae Christianae* 29, no. 1 (March 1975): 1-14.

<sup>40</sup> Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 32.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

divinity of the Holy Spirit on the authority of Scripture and the ‘tradition of the apostles’ in the doxologies and liturgical formulae?

This survey identifies Basil’s arguments for the divinity of the Holy Spirit in his *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos (De Spiritu Sancto)* and examines to what extent, if any, they were based upon some of the principles that Athanasius had established a decade earlier in the *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. Also, this study considers Drecoll’s observation that Basil diverts from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the ‘Eusebian – Origen’ tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit’s role in sanctification.<sup>41</sup> This survey seeks to trace the flow of ideas on the divinity of the Holy Spirit along distinct paths. The ideas that form Athanasius’ Trinitarian principles applied to the Holy Spirit appear to varying extent in the writings of both Apolinarius and Basil. Given Basil’s withdrawal from contact with Apolinarius after their brief exchange of letters in the 360s, it seems necessary to re-trace the prevailing direction in the flow of ideas between Athanasius, Apolinarius and Basil.

The influence of Athanasius on Basil is assessed by way of a comparison of their principle points of argument in the works *Epistulae ad Serapionem* and *De Spiritu Sancto*. Athanasius in his *Epistulae ad Serapionem* gives these key principles about the Holy Spirit:

- (1) The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father;
- (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;
- (3) The Holy Spirit gives life;
- (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;
- (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;
- (6) The Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son;

---

<sup>41</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 152-159.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

(7) The Holy Spirit ‘in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things’ participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>42</sup>

Basil in *De Spiritu Sancto* presents these key principles about the Holy Spirit:

(1) The Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father;

(2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;

(3) The Holy Spirit gives life;

(4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;

(5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;

(6) The Holy Spirit gives gifts to the ‘worthy’;

(7) The Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>43</sup>

This survey seeks to trace the flow of the two key theological ideas – *unity of substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit – in the years 358 to 378, where they appear in the writings of both proponents *and* opponents. Then it proceeds to search the evidence from doctrinal statements in these writings that the development of these two theological ideas came about in the struggle between the Homoousion party and their opponents, chiefly the Homoian semi-Arian party, the so-called ‘Eusebians’.

This study seeks to show that influences that Basil and Athanasius have in common are extant in the writings of Pseudo-Athanasius, Apolinarius of Laodicea, and each other. It also takes into account the doctrinal statements of Eusebius of Caesarea, Asterius of Cappadocia, Acacius of Caesarea, and Eunomius of Cyzicus, the *opponents*, whose ideas Basil and Athanasius abhorred. In doing so, this enquiry seeks to show that Athanasius and Basil, due to their engagement with these opponents over the key theological ideas of *unity*

---

<sup>42</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. ad Serap.*, in Shapland, *Op. cit.* I.9, 23; 82, 127.

<sup>43</sup> Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:36.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*of substance* and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit, focused their own views on these ideas and sharpened their own arguments in support of them.

While numerous studies address the development of Pneumatology during the fourth century, this survey finds that Hübner and Drecolli have significantly contributed to modern understanding of the emergence and flow of theological ideas concerning the Holy Spirit. So far, however, their differing approaches to the analysis of this content and the resulting debate have received little response from scholars.<sup>44</sup>

Hübner and Drecolli have described and tested methods of analysing texts for connections, with a view to mapping the flow of theological ideas in the formation of doctrine on the Holy Spirit. They began with charting the possible flow of ideas between protagonists in the late fourth-century discussions of the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Following on the work of Hübner and Drecolli, this survey looks at the flow of theological ideas amongst both proponents *and* opponents, with the view that the engagement between them over the key theological ideas of *unity of substance* and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit can add yet a third useful dimension to the search for the emergence and flow of key theological ideas in development of Church teaching on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>44</sup> Lienhard, Joseph T., SJ, 'Review of *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* By Reinhard M. Hübner'. *Church History*, 59 no. 4 (Dec 1990), 540-541. Lienhard, one of the very few scholars who have commented on the subject, describes Reinhard M. Hübner's thesis in this way, 'In sum· Photinus of Sirmium had been censured in the East and West by 351. Hübner postulates that, without naming him, Apolinaris refuted him [Photinus] in the *C. Sab.* around 350 to 360, and this small work provided crucial elements for Basil the Great's theology. Time will judge his thesis. But Hübner has made a valuable contribution by pointing out that Apolinaris's role in the history of trinitarian doctrine has been neglected.'

### ***Chapter 1: The debate between Hübner and Drecoll***

The modern scholars Reinhard M. Hübner and Volker H. Drecoll have charted new routes in the quest to shed light onto the complex history and development of the teaching on the Holy Spirit during the crucial fourth century. Their search for the connections of ideas and texts that highlight this development was recently intensified by Hübner, whose *Habilitationsschrift* [post-doctoral writing] drew strenuous debate and criticism from Drecoll. Despite some common areas of understanding, where they both believe that the ideas that came into play in the development of teaching on the Holy Spirit can be better understood by reading the texts derived from the main proponents Marcellus of Ancyra, Athanasius of Alexandria, Apolinarius of Laodicea and Basil of Caesarea, they disagree on who contributed what to this development of teaching and when. The Hübner and Drecoll findings, therefore, are useful in this study where they chart the possible flow of ideas between these protagonists in discussions of Pneumatology. In recent patristic studies, Basil of Caesarea has come to be regarded as the key contributor who set the course of orthodox Pneumatology with his *Contra Eunomium III* in the early 360s and his more substantial contribution, *De Spiritu Sancto* in the 370s. Scholars have examined his ideas in some detail, and recent findings suggest that there is a need to examine further his contribution relative to that of his contemporaries in the light of unanswered questions implicit in the history and development of orthodox teaching on the Holy Spirit in the fourth century.

#### ***Hübner's argument***

Reinhard M. Hübner (now Professor Emeritus of Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Germany) presented his thesis in 1970 to the Catholic Faculty of Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn, and then published it in 1974 as *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).<sup>45</sup> He challenged the view of Ritschl and Harnack that Gregory of Nyssa's soteriology was based primarily on a Platonic model of the unity of humankind. Hübner asserted that one must look to the divine image in humankind for the key

---

<sup>45</sup> Hübner, Reinhard M., *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der 'Physischen' Erlösungslehre*, Philosophia Patrum: Interpretations of Patristic Texts, II. (Leiden, 1974).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

to Gregory's view of soteriology. Also, Hübner argued that Marcellus of Ancyra along with other fourth-century writers influenced Gregory's theology. In 1976, Hübner wrote his *Habilitationsschrift*, which he published in 1989 as *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter). In this work he argues that Apolinarius [*sic*] is the author of *Contra Sabellianos* (in Migne's *Patrologia graeca* part of Athanasius' writings).<sup>46</sup> Hübner further argues that Basil of Caesarea borrowed from this treatise of Apolinarius to compose his *Homilia XXIV*.<sup>47</sup> In a later work in 1999, *Der paradox Eine. Antignostischer Monarchianismus im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Leiden: E. J. Brill), with a contribution by Markus Vinzent, Hübner traces the pervasive influence of Monarchianism through writings from the post-Apostolic period, especially Ignatius and Irenaeus, through to the time of Noetus of Smyrna.<sup>48</sup> Hübner's later work continues to trace the influence of Monarchianism where it seems to emerge in the fourth-century discussions on the Son and the Holy Spirit.<sup>49</sup>

The history of Hübner's research shows that he started off with – amongst other topics – surveying and exploring the soteriology of Gregory of Nyssa, discovering the Cappadocian's close relation to Marcellus of Ancyra and to the pro-Nicene writer Apolinarius. Although he no longer maintains that one of the main texts that served to show Gregory's dependency upon the thinking of Marcellus was indeed authored by the latter (Ps.-Ath., *De Inc. et C. Ar.*), as can be seen from his later remarks in his *Habilitation* (Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius...*, 1989, 130 note 17), there is still enough evidence for showing the

---

<sup>46</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *In Librum Contra Sabellianos Monitum* (PG 28). *Patrologia graeca* [Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca]. Edited by J.-P. Migne (162 vols Paris, 1857-1886).

<sup>47</sup> Hübner, Reinhard M., *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin: (Pseudo-Athanasius, contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* (Berlin, 1989).

<sup>48</sup> Hübner, Reinhard M., *Der paradox Eine. Antignostischer Monarchianismus im Zweiten Jahrhundert*. With a contribution by Markus Vinzent. In *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae*, 50. (Leiden, 1999).

<sup>49</sup> Markus Vinzent, 'Pseudo-Athanasius, Oratio contra Arianos IV – Apolinarius' earliest extant work'. (London: King's College, 2012). It is important to note that patristic scholars have variously used the spellings 'Apolinarius', 'Apollinaris' and 'Apollinarius' for this so-named pro-Nicene writer. For consistency with current scholarship, this study will observe the convention of 'Apolinarius', except in cases where the cited author applies a different spelling – such as with Professor Drecoll, who spells the name 'Apollinaris' in his *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea* (Göttingen, 1994).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Cappadocian's reliance on earlier Nicene, and more specifically Marcellus', thinking. Thus, for example, he continues to look for influences from earlier Nicene writers on the work of Basil of Caesarea.

Part of that story involves Basil's correspondence with Apolinarius (represented by *Epistulae* 361-364 in *PG* 32:1099-1108), which receives more detail later in this study. Hübner devotes a small part of his Habilitation to describing the content of that correspondence, which he regards as authoritative: '...the two letters (*Ep.* 362, and 364) are used from the correspondence of St. Basil of Caesarea, with Apolinarius. This exchange of letters was for a time regarded as spurious. But its authenticity has been convincingly demonstrated by G. L. Prestige and H. de Riedmatten.'<sup>50</sup> His choice of primary source texts for this correspondence are those gleaned by Father Henri de Riedmatten.<sup>51</sup>

Hübner describes his view of key developments around the issue of describing the nature and being of the Son in relation to the Father. It is necessary to resist the obvious temptation to keep both terms [*ousios* and *hypostasis*] fully interchangeable, if only because the same is said in connection with the mention of the *hypostasis* of the Father as for the person of the Son. The reason for this reluctance is a piece from the correspondence of St. Basil with Apolinarius,

---

<sup>50</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 198. Ferner werden die zwei Briefe (ep. 362 und 364) aus der Korrespondenz des Basilius von Caesarea mit Apolinarius herangezogen. Dieser Briefwechsel galt eine Zeitlang als unecht. Seine Authentizität wurde aber überzeugend von G. L. Prestige und H. de Riedmatten nachgewiesen.

<sup>51</sup> Riedmatten, Henri de, "La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée I u. II": *JThS* N. S. 7 (1956) 199-210; 8 (1957) 53-70. In note 2, pp. 199-200, Riedmatten describes his sources: Epp. 361-364 se trouvent dans l'édition bénédictine des oeuvres de Basile, t. III, pp. 463-6. Toutes mes citations de Basile se référeront à cette édition qui se retrouve reproduite dans *P.G.* XXIX-XXXII, alourdie de fautes d'impression. L'édition de J. A. Mingarelli du 'περὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας' se trouve dans la *Nuova Raccolta d'Opuscoli scientifici e filologici*, de Calogera, 33 (Venetia, 1779), sous le titre: *Epistola quarto Ecclesiae saeculo conficta et a Basilio Magno saepius commemorata quam, D. Johannes Aloysius Mingarelli Abbas Generalis Congreg. Rhenanae Canonorum Reg. S. Salvatoris ex Passionejanis membranis nunc primum edita una cum Emendationibus et Variis lectionibus Commentariorum S. Hieronymi in Matthaeum e Bononiensi codice excerptis*. L. Sebastiani intitule son ouvrage, *Epistola ad Apollinarem Laodicenum celeberrima de Divina Essentia Divi Basilii nomine ab Eustathio Sebasteno toto fere Oriente per summum scelus olim vulgate ex Codice MS. Bibliothecae Angelicae graece et latine nunc primum in lucem prodit historica Narratione et Animadversionibus Illustrata* (Romae, 1796), pp. LXVIII+120; le texte se trouve, pp. 23-29.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

which has been ignored. In the ideas and concepts of [*Epistulae* 361-362] can be found text that provide us a different view of *C. Sabellianos*.<sup>52</sup>

In *Epistula* 361 Basil had asked Apolinarius how the Nicene *homoousios* could be understood without the fall into a notion unworthy of God, without the necessity that one must adopt a common genus concept or a previously existing matter substrate or a portion of an Earlier in the Later. Apolinarius answers in *Epistula* 362 that this can be stated in a different sense from *genos*, namely, in the way all people have the same *genos* and the same *ousia*, which was imparted to them by their ancestor (*genarches*) Adam communicated in identity. The relationship that springs between paternal peculiarity of the very first beginning or principle (*arche*) and the entity resulting from the progenitor of gender (*genos*) enables one to compare to some extent with the relationship of ‘single principle’ (that is God) to the ‘only begotten product’ if it only will of human conceptions, e.g. the idea of common relationships that exist between brothers.<sup>53</sup>

When [contemplating] the Father and the Son, there is not likeness, but the Father and the Son are explicitly principle from principle. So there is no portion of the earlier in the later as in bodies, but procreation (*apogennesis*). For the peculiarity of the Father is not insofar as he is the Father divided into the Son, but the Son is shining forth from the Father, one and the same in otherness and another in sameness, that is to say, the Father was in the Son and the Son was in the Father (John 10:38; 14:10). Neither can the otherness simply preserve the truth of sonship, yet again, the sameness of the undivided hypostasis...<sup>54</sup>

In the above-cited quote (text 100) is *John* 10:38; 14:10 as a written document for the declaration of the otherness of the people in the sameness of *ousia*. This

---

<sup>52</sup> See Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 236.

<sup>53</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 236.

<sup>54</sup> Apolinarius, *ep.* 362 [ad Basil of Caesarea: 203, 23-30 Riedmatten] in Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 236. Bei Vater und Sohn gibt es dergleichen nicht, vielmehr ist der Vater durchaus Prinzip und der Sohn aus dem Prinzip. Es gibt also auch keine Abteilung des Früheren in das Spätere wie bei Körpern, sondern Zeugung (*apogennesis*). Denn die Eigentümlichkeit des Vaters ist auch nicht, insofern er Vater ist, in den Sohn abgeteilt, sondern die des Sohnes ist aus der des Vaters hervorgeleuchtet, ein und dasselbe in Andersheit und ein anderes in Selbigkeit, wie es heißt, daß der Vater im Sohn sei und der Sohn im Vater (Joh 10,38; 14,10). Denn weder kann die Andersheit einfachhin die Wahrheit der Sohn-schaft bewahren, noch wiederum die Selbigkeit die Unteilbarkeit der Hypostase ...



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

reads like a concise summary of the exegesis of this word in Scripture [evident in the treatise] *C. Sabell.* 7 (108C-109B). A passage at the end of the letter [text 101] comes even closer to the terminology of the treatise. Apolinarius explained there why [the Son's essence] could only be spoken of as identical to, but not like, the *ousia* of God.<sup>55</sup>

Whoever takes the *ousia* as a label but not an identity asserts a physical resemblance and assigns this to the Son; yet that is possible only for those who are like God. But who knows that the similarity is reasonable creatures, the unique connection of the Son with the Father is such that they are one in identity, but in derived identity so he was not about the Father or a part of the Father ... He is God, not insofar as he is the one but inasmuch as he is from Him, not as the model but as the image, this is *homoousios*, exclusively and in a peculiar way before anyone else ... as the one and only offspring (*apogennema*) from the single *genos* and *eidos* of the deity, unseparatedly and unphysically proceeding from, whilst bearing witness to, the Father, uniquely emergent into the individuality begotten.<sup>56</sup>

The passage is reminiscent of what is said in *C. Sabellianos* 2 (100B-C) about teaching the knowledge of the invisible God being made visible by the Son appearing in the flesh, except that there knowledge of the necessity of this pathway even with the invisibility of the Father occupied by *John* 1:18 is well founded. The missing statement of *John* 14:9 in Basil is insufficient actually to speak of a 'pathway (ἄνοδος) of knowledge'. The brevity and lack of uniqueness of the quote from *John* 14:9 make it likely that the idea was taken from the treatise of Apolinarius. This will take one to the image theology of the treatise in the immediate vicinity of where the more important terms and statements are gathered, albeit in a slightly different combination. To the verse *Colossians* 1:15,

---

<sup>55</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 239.

<sup>56</sup> Apolinarius, *Ep.* 362 [*ad* Basil of Caesarea: 204, 36-46 Riedmatten] in Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 239. Wer nämlich die *ousia* in keinerlei Identität annimmt, führt eine äußerliche Ähnlichkeit ein und weist sie dem Sohn zu; das aber ist doch bis herab zu den Menschen möglich, die Gott ähnlich werden. Wer aber weiß, daß die Ähnlichkeit den Geschöpfen angemessen ist, verbindet den Sohn mit dem Vater in Identität, jedoch in geminderter Identität, damit er nicht etwa der Vater sei oder ein Teil des Vaters ... So ist er Gott, nicht insofern er jener ist, sondern insofern er aus jenem ist, nicht als Urbild, sondern Bild; dieser ist *homoousios*, ausschließlich und in eigentümlicher Weise vor allen anderen, ... als der einzige und alleinige Abkömmling (*apogennema*) aus dem einzigen *genos* und *eidos* der Gottheit, in ungetrenntem und unkörperlichem Hervorgang, insofern das Zeugende, in der zeugenden Eigentümlichkeit verharrend, in die gezeugte Eigentümlichkeit hervortrat.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

which is quoted here only in one book, St. Basil says that the image of the invisible God is not like a work of art but a vivid picture or rather life itself, which disallows unvarying equality in *ousia*. The same is in the treatise 105B and 108A-B. The modification is that in St. Basil the image Apolinarius refers to is the power to be alive and cause life. Shortly before, Basil had said that visible in the seal is the impression of the character of the Former, the knowledge of the archetype will prove through the picture, since one can regard both in the identity (ταυτότης). Even in his request to Apolinarius he had struggled with an identity of *ousia* between Father and Son. Here he (first) seems to accept it, just on the basis given in Apolinarius' treatise (105B, 108A-B, 109A). In this case, however, there are perhaps parallels in the response letter of Apolinarius to which H. de Riedmatten refers more closely.<sup>57</sup> With mention of the 'character' Basil probably has *Hebrews* 1:3 in view, which he later presented in the same context, paraphrasing back a little and in Chapter 20. *Hebrews* 1:3 is evaluated along with *Col.* 1:15 in the treatise on the image theology (105B, 108B; 109A-B). In the letter of Apolinarius to St. Basil the two verses of Scripture do not occur in Basil's *Against Eunomius I*, only here.<sup>58</sup>

In the context of the term *hypostasis* Hübner observes that (Hübner p. 237) Apolinarius' use of it can actually be justified only in his discernible conservatism when he - at least up to a certain point - reserves the word *hypostasis* to the Father, for so it is given in *Hebrews* 1:3, as the Son is 'brightness of His (God's) glory and extent of His *hypostasis*'. Apolinarius quotes this verse in the *Apodeixis* and called the Son in a fragment of *Matthew*

---

<sup>57</sup> Apolinarius *Ep.* 362 in Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 204:36-42. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ ταυτότητι παραδεξάμενοι τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ἐξῶθεν φέροντες τῷ Υἱῷ προστιθέασιν, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἕως ἀνθρώπων διαβαίνει τῶν ὁμοιουμένων τῷ Θεῷ. Οἱ δὲ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τοῖς ποιήμασι πρέπουσαν εἰδότες ἐν ταυτότητι μὲν τὸν Υἱὸν συνάπτουσι Πατρί, ὑφειμένη δὲ τῇ ταυτότητι, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ἢ μέρος Πατρός, ἃ δυνατῶς παρίσταται τῷ «ἄλλος Υἱός»...

<sup>58</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 252-253; see also Riedmatten, *La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée II*, 65f, in which he examines the parallels in themes and phrases between Basil's two works *Contra Eunomium* and *Epistula 361*, together with Apolinarius' response *Epistula 362*: "Une dernière démarche s'impose à nous avant de conclure. L'oeuvre doctrinale de Basile apporte-t-elle quelque indice qui confirme ou, au contraire, infirme la these de l'authenticité des pieces que nous examinons? Le *Contra Eunomium*, dont j'ai dit qu'il se situait près de la date à laquelle *ep. 361-362* se donnent pour avoir été rédigées, présente de notables points de contact avec elles. Qu'on en juge par les texts suivants où je souligne thèmes et expressions communs..."

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

‘divine character’. The equivalence of the terms ‘image of God’, ‘Image of the Father’, ‘picture of God’, ‘Nature of the *hypostasis* (God)’ led him to use the word *hypostasis* initially only for the Father. It is also an expression of the divine *ousia* and the personal uniqueness of the Father, as Divinity is the unique property of the Father. Since the request of Basil (*Epistula* 361) and the response of Apolinarius (*Epistula* 362) is likely to have occurred in the period soon after the Synod of Constantinople (360), and are certainly not to be dated later than 362, a fixed terminus is found for Apolinarius before the Trinitarian formula ‘one *ousia* - three *hypostases*’ is used.<sup>59</sup>

Hübner explains that Basil takes up the image theology in Chapter 20 once again, and justifies the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. There is in his books *Against Eunomius* the only place where he mentioned the ὁμοούσιον, with which he was not convinced in his letter [*Ep.* 361] to Apolinarius. Now he puts it on the same grounds that he found in the treatise (108B) for this: ‘It is not possible that the God of the universe, with his own image that shines timeless, not be together from eternity and not have a connection to time but indeed be exalted above all eons. That is why he is called “reflection”, so that we recognize the interconnectedness, and “nature of the *hypostasis*” (*Heb.* 1:3), so that we learn ὁμοούσιον (ἐκμανθάνωμεν)’. Hübner observes that in his books *Against Eunomius* he [Basil] definitely still preferred the *homoiousian* formula ‘is equal to the *ousia*’. For a reference to the treatise of Apolinarius argues different reasons, this means that the interpretation of the *homoousion* here differs from what Basil presents in two places in *Contra Eunomium II*. There he declared (against Eunomius): ‘The people work on the projects through their art, yet they are *homoousioi* with them as the potter with the clay and the shipbuilder with the wood. Yes both are equally body and equally perceptible and earthen’. This statement he contradicts at a later point by significantly relying again on the image theology: ‘... put in human terms, we find that we do not perceive *ousia* from the works of the artist, because it is not possible to learn from the *ousia* of the builder of the house, but from the begotten (*gennema*) one can easily recognize the nature of the producer. Therefore, if the Son is a creature, He shall not represent us; but if He has the *ousia* of the Father, then we recognize that He

---

<sup>59</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237.

is not a creature but the true Son, image of God, and “nature of the hypostasis” (*Heb.* 1:3).’ In Hübner’s view, the second point presents the reasoning of Apollinarius for the *ousia* of the Father and Son, as prior to Basil’s own. The apparent contradiction testifies most clearly that Basil has taken unfamiliar ideas and not yet fully integrated them.<sup>60</sup>

There are connections in thought between Basil’s *Ep.* 361 and *Homilia XXIV*, which are of interest in this discussion. These will be identified briefly before turning to Apollinarius’ answer to Basil, *Ep.* 362 and the possible intersections in thought between this letter and the two treatises: Basil’s *Homilia XXIV* and Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos*.

*Ep.* 361 [Basil of Caesarea] To Apollinaris [*sic*]

Basil to my most revered master Apollinaris. We wrote to you previously about obscurities in the scriptures and rejoiced both at what you replied and at what you promised. But now greater anxiety has overtaken us on a more important subject – in which we have no one else among living men to invoke as colleague and champion such as God has given us in you, precise both in understanding and in utterance (cf. 1 *Cor.* 1:5), and at the same time accessible.

Those authors of universal confusion who have filled the world with arguments and speculations have rejected the term ‘substance’ [οὐσία] as foreign to the divine oracles; so please show us in what sense the fathers used it and whether you have not ever found it standing in the scriptures. (They deride ‘daily bread’ [ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, *Matt.* 6:11] and ‘peculiar people’ [λαὸς περιούσιος, *Tit.* 2:14] and anything else of the sort as irrelevant.)<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 253-254.

<sup>61</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *Epistula 361*, in *PG* 32:1099 and Riedmatten, *La correspondence I*, 202-203; English translation in Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London 1956) 38-39. Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ αἰδεσιμωτάτῳ Ἀπολιναρίῳ Βασιλείῳ. Πρότερον μὲν σοι περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς ἀσαφῶν ἐπεστέλλομεν καὶ ἠὺφραινόμεθα οἷς τε ἔπεμψες καὶ οἷς ὑπισχνοῦ. Νῦν δὲ μείζων ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ μειζόνων ἢ φροντίς προσελήλυθεν, εἰς ἣν οὐδένα ἕτερον ἔχομεν ἐν τοῖς νῦν ἀνθρώποις τοιοῦτον κοινωνὸν καὶ προστάτην ἐπικαλέσασθαι ὁποῖόν σε καὶ ἐν γνώσει καὶ ἐν λόγῳ ἀκριβῆ τε ὁμοῦ καὶ εὐπρόσιτον ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῖν ἐδωρήσατο. Ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ πάντα φύροντες καὶ λόγων καὶ ζητημάτων τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐμπλήσαντες τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα ὡς ἀλλότριον τῶν θείων λογίων ἐξέβαλον, καταξίωσον ἡμῖν σημεῖαν ὅπως τε οἱ Πατέρες αὐτῷ ἐχρήσαντο καὶ εἰ μηδαμοῦ εὗρες ἐν τῇ Γραφῇ κείμενον. Τὸν γὰρ ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον καὶ τὸν λαὸν τὸν περιούσιον καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὡς οὐδὲν ἔχοντα κοινὸν διαπτύουσιν. Ἐπειτα μέντοι καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου (οὗ ἕνεκεν ἡγοῦμαι ταῦτα κατασκευάζειν αὐτοὺς βαθέως τὴν οὐσίαν διαβάλλοντας ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδεμίαν χώραν τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ καταλιπεῖν) διαλαβεῖν ἡμῖν πλατύτερον βουλήθητι τίνα τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πῶς ἂν ὑγιῶς λέγοιτο ἐφ’ ὧν οὔτε γένος κοινὸν ὑπερκείμενον θεωρεῖται οὔτε ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον προϋπάρχον, οὐκ ἀπομερισμὸς τοῦ

Next please give us a full discussion of the actual *homoousion*, as I believe this is the object of their manœuvres –they are making a dead set at ‘substance’ so as to leave no opening for ‘consubstantial’. What does it bear? In what healthy sense can it be applied to objects as to which one can conceive no common genus [γένος] transcending them, no material substratum pre-existing them, and no partition of the original to make the second? Pray distinguish for us fully in what sense we ought to call the Son ‘of one substance with’ the Father without falling into any of the above notions.

Our own idea is this. Whatever one takes the substance of the Father to be in basic reality, one is entirely bound to take the substance of the Son to be that too. Hence if we call the substance of the Father immaterial [νοητός], eternal, unbegotten light, we shall describe the substance of the Only-begotten as immaterial, eternal begotten light. But it seems to me that the expression ‘undeviatingly similar’ fits such a notion better than ‘of one substance’. I feel that one light displaying no difference of greater or less intensity from another light is not ‘the same’, since each consists in a particular determinate substance, but should rightly be described as precisely and undeviatingly similar in substance. So whether these are the ideas we ought to maintain in discussion, or others of greater weight should be substituted, do you, like a wise physician (for I have disclosed to you just what is in my heart), cure what is sickly and underpin what is unsound, and stablish us in every way.

I greet the brethren who accompany your reverence and beg them along with you to pray for us that we may be saved. Our friend Gregory has chosen to live with his parents, and is with them. May you be preserved to us in good health as long as possible, assisting us both by your prayers and your understanding.<sup>62</sup>

---

προτέρου εἰς τὸ δεύτερον. Πῶς οὖν χρή λέγειν ὁμοούσιον τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ εἰς μηδεμίαν ἔννοιαν τῶν εἰρημένων καταπίπτοντας θέλησον ἡμῖν πλατύτερον διαρθρῶσαι. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ὑπελήφαμεν· ὅπερ ἂν εἶναι καθ’ ὑπόθεσιν ἢ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσία ληφθῇ, τοῦτο εἶναι πάντως ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὴν τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνεσθαι. Ὡστε εἰ φῶς νοητόν, αἰδῖον, ἀγέννητον τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίαν τις λέγοι, φῶς νοητόν, αἰδῖον, γεννητόν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς οὐσίαν ἐρεῖ. Πρὸς δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ἔννοιαν δοκεῖ μοι ἢ τοῦ ἀπαράλλάκτως ὁμοίου φωνῇ μᾶλλον ἢ περ ἢ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἀρμόττειν. Φῶς γὰρ φωτὶ μηδεμίαν ἐν τῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον τὴν διαφορὰν ἔχον ταῦτόν μὲν οὐκ εἶναι, διότι ἐν ἰδίᾳ περιγραφῇ τῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἐκάτερον, ὅμοιον δὲ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἀπαράλλάκτως ὀρθῶς ἂν οἶμαι λέγεσθαι. Εἴτε οὖν ταύτας χρή διαλέγεσθαι τὰς ἐννοίας εἴτε ἑτέρας μείζους ἀντιλαβεῖν, ὥς σοφὸς ἰατρός (καὶ γὰρ ἐξεφῆνα μὲν σοὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ) τὸ μὲν ἀρρωστοῦν ἴασαι, τὸ δὲ σαθρὸν ὑποστήριξον, παντὶ δὲ τρόπῳ βεβαίωσον ἡμᾶς. Τοὺς μετὰ τῆς εὐλαβείας σου ἀδελφοὺς ἀσπάζομαι καὶ ἀξιῶ μετὰ σοῦ εὐχεσθαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα σωθῶμεν. Ὁ ἐταῖρος Γρηγόριος τὸν μετὰ τῶν γονέων ἐλόμενος βίον αὐτοῖς σύνεστιν. Ὑγιαίνων ἐπιπλεῖστον φυλαχθείης ἡμῖν ὠφελῶν ἡμᾶς καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ τῇ γνώσει.

<sup>62</sup> Basil, *Ep.* 361, in *PG* 32:1099-1108 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 202-203; English translation in Prestige, *St Basil*, 38-39.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Now for a look at the connections in thought between Basil's *Ep. 361* and *Homilia XXIV*, before considering Apolinarius' answer to Basil, *Ep. 362* and whether or not the ideas it presents intersect with the two treatises: Basil's *Homilia XXIV* and Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos*.

*Homily XXIV, against the Sabellians, Arians and Anomæans* is summarised in *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:lx-lxi as follows:<sup>63</sup>

...And you I exhort not to be specially anxious to hear from me what is pleasing to yourselves, but rather what is pleasing to the Lord, what is in harmony with the Scriptures, what is not in opposition to the Fathers. What, then, I asserted concerning the Son, that we ought to acknowledge His proper Person, this I have also to say concerning the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is not identical with the Father, because of its being written 'God is a Spirit.' [*John* 6:24] Nor on the other hand is there one Person of Son and of Spirit, because it is said, 'If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his. ...Christ is in you.' [*Rom.* 8:9 and 10] From this passage some persons have been deceived into the opinion that the Spirit and Christ are identical. But what do we assert? That in this passage is declared the intimate relation of nature and not a confusion of persons. For there exists the Father having His existence perfect and independent, root and fountain of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. There exists also the Son living in full Godhead, Word and begotten offspring of the Father, independent. Full too is the Spirit, not part of another, but contemplated whole and perfect in Himself. The Son is inseparably conjoined with the Father and the Spirit with the Son. For there is nothing to divide nor to cut asunder the eternal conjunction. No age intervenes, nor yet can our souls entertain a thought of separation as though the Only-begotten were not ever with the Father, or the Holy Spirit not co-existent with the Son. Whenever then we conjoin the Trinity, be careful not to imagine the Three as parts of one undivided thing, but receive the idea of the undivided and common essence of the three perfect incorporeal [existences]. Wherever is the presence of the Holy Spirit, there is the indwelling of Christ: wherever Christ is, there the Father is present. 'Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you?' [*1 Cor.* 6:19]

At this point, it is well to identify some connections in thought between Basil's *Ep. 361*<sup>64</sup> and *Homilia XXIV*.<sup>65</sup> Early in Basil's letter *Ep. 361*, (Riedmatten, *Op.*

---

<sup>63</sup> Basil, *Homilia XXIV*, summarised in *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:lx-lxi.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*cit.*, 202:2-7) to Apolinarius, Basil asked Apolinarius, whom he regarded as a trusted colleague with precise understanding, for clarification on the *homoousios*. In the body of the letter (Riedmatten, *Op. cit.*, 202:13-20) Basil asks how the term *homoousios* can be applied to the Father and Son for whom there is no apparent commonality in genus or substratum; in *Hom. XXIV* he applies *homoousion* to the common essence of the Father and the Son. Towards the end of *Ep. 361* (Riedmatten, *Op. cit.*, 202:26f) Basil describes the necessity to view the substance of the Son to be ‘undeviatingly similar’ to that of the Father; he shifts his language somewhat in *Hom. XXIV* to ‘undivided and common essence’ and applies it to the Son and also to the Holy Spirit.

Apolinarius answered the request Basil made in *Epistle 361* with a detailed exposition of the *homousion* in his response, *Epistle 362*.

Epistula 362 [Apolinarius] to Basil

Your faith shows love of God and your questions love of study; we owe you a ready answer for affection’s sake, even though it should prove inadequate owing to our deficiencies and the immensity of the subject.

‘One substance’ applies not only numerically, as you use it, referring to a single determinate object, but also individually to two men or two of any other kind that comprises a single stock [τῶν κατὰ γένος ἐνιζομένων]; hence in this sense two or more specimens are ‘the same’ in substance. For instance, all we men are Adam and are one man; David’s son is David, as being the same as he is; and as you rightly say, the Son is in substance exactly what the Father is. In no other sense could the Son be God, since the Father is acknowledged as the one and only God. In the same way, I suppose, there is only one Adam, the progenitor [γενάρχης] of mankind, and one David, the founder [ἀρχηγέτης] of the royal stock [γένος].<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Basil, *Ep. 361*, in *PG* 32:1099-1108 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 202-203; English translation in Prestige, *St Basil*, 39-43.

<sup>65</sup> Basil, *Homilia XXIV*, in *PG* 31.

<sup>66</sup> Apolinarius, *Ep. 362*, in *PG* 32:1099-1108 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 203-204; English translation in Prestige, *St Basil*, 39-43. Φιλοθέως πιστεύεις καὶ φιλόλογος ζητεῖς, καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν τὸ πρόθυμον ὀφείλεται διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, εἰ καὶ τὸ ἱκανὸν τῷ λόγῳ μὴ ἔποιτο διὰ τὸ ἡμέτερον ἐνδεές καὶ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος ὑπερφυές. Οὐσία μία οὐκ ἀριθμῷ μόνον λέγεται, ὥσπερ λέγεις, καὶ τὸ ἐν μιᾷ περιγραφῇ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίως ἀνθρώπων δύο καὶ ἄλλου ὁτουοῦν τῶν κατὰ γένος ἐνιζομένων, ὥστε ταύτη γε καὶ δύο καὶ πλείονα ταῦτὸν εἶναι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν, καθὼ καὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι Ἀδάμ ἐσμεν εἰς ὄντες καὶ Δαβὶδ ὁ τοῦ Δαβὶδ υἱὸς ὡς ταῦτὸν ὦν ἐκείνῳ, καθὰ καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν λέγεις καλῶς τοῦτο εἶναι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ὅπερ ὁ Πατήρ. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐτέρως ἂν ἦν

In this way we shall avoid attributing the idea of a single transcending genus [γένος] or a single underlying material to the Father and the Son, when we compare the originative self [γενναρχική ιδιότης] of the ultimate source, and the stocks [γένος] derived from such originals [γενάρχη], to the Offspring only-begotten out of the one Source. (For in some extent such examples tend to ‘similarity’.) For instance, no one transcending genus is applicable to Adam, who was formed by God (*Gen.* 2:7), and ourselves who are begotten by men, but he himself is the source of mankind. Nor is any such relation presupposed between David, as such, and the stock that sprang from David, since the self-hood of David originates from himself and he himself is the basic stuff of all his descendants. But when these are set aside, the presupposition does apply, since other mutual relations do exist in common between all men, such as collateral ties. But between the Father and the Son nothing of the sort exists but, in short, the Father is source and the Son comes out of that source.

There is no partition of the original to make the second, as with physical beings, but a begetting. The Father’s self has not, so to speak, been partitioned in order to make the Son, but the Son’s [self] has come forth as a ray out of the Father’s [self]; it is the same thing in otherness, and another thing in identity [ταυτότης], according as it is said that the Father is in the Son and the Son [is] in the Father (*John* 10:38). For, neither will the otherness by itself secure the reality of the sonship nor again will the identity secure the indivisibility of the new substantive entity [ὑποστάσις]; each has mutual relations and singleness of ‘pattern’, and is the same thing in another way and another in the same way, if one may strain terms which cannot be stretched far enough to express the facts; and the Lord confirms our conclusion by representing the Father as ‘greater’ while equal, and the Son as possessing equality while subordinate (cf. *John* 10:29-30, 36-8; 14:28). This teaches us to picture the one as light of identical form, but reduced intensity; we are not to change the substance, but to regard the same thing at full intensity and after

---

Θεὸς ὁ Υἱός, ἐνὸς ὁμολογουμένου καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὡς πού καὶ εἶς Ἀδάμ ὁ ἀνθρώπων γενάρχης καὶ εἶς Δαβὶδ ὁ τοῦ βασιλείου γένους ἀρχηγέτης. Ταύτη γέ τοι καὶ ἐν εἶναι γένος ὑπερκείμενον ἢ μίαν ὕλην ὑποκειμένην ἐπὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ περιαιρεθήσεται τῶν ὑπονοίων, ὅταν τὴν γενναρχικὴν παραλάβωμεν ιδιότητα τῆς ἀνωτάτω ἀρχῆς καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν γενάρχων γένη πρὸς τὸ ἐκ τῆς μιᾶς ἀρχῆς μονογενὲς γέννημα. Μετρίως γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς ὁμοίωσιν ἔρχεται. Καθὸ μὴδὲ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὡς θεοπλάστου καὶ ἡμῶν ὡς ἀνθρωπογενήτων ἐν ὑπέγκειται γένος, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀρχή· μήτε ὕλη κοινὴ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἢ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ὑπόθεσις. Μήτε μὴν τοῦ Δαβὶδ καὶ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἐκ Δαβὶδ προεπινοεῖται καθὸ Δαβὶδ, ἐπεὶπερ ἢ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ιδιότης ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἄρχεται καὶ ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντων αὐτός, ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ταῦτα ἀπολείπεται καθὸ εἰσιν ἕτεραι κοινότητες ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οἷαι ἂν ἀδελφῶν· ἐπὶ δὲ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τοιοῦτον οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὅλον Πατὴρ ἀρχὴ καὶ Υἱὸς ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς.



reduction.

Those who refuse to accept any identity in the substance introduce the extraneous idea of ‘similarity’ and apply it to the Son; which indeed holds good so far as concerns men who are ‘assimilated’ to God. But those who realize that ‘similarity’ properly applies to created objects express the connection of the Son to the Father in terms of ‘identity’ – but a reduced identity. That he is not the actual Father, or a part of the Father (which is impossible), is established by the principle that the Son is God in another way: he is God, not in the same way as the Father is God, but as being out of him – not prototype but image. He is of-one-substance in a quite exclusive and individual sense; not like members of the same species or bits partitioned from the same lump, but as the one and only offspring from the single stock and ‘pattern’ of the deity, issuing in an inseparable and non-physical manner, in such wise that what begets continues to be its generative self [ιδιότης] while issuing as a begotten self.<sup>67</sup>

Now the discussion progresses to considering Apolinarius’ answer to Basil, *Ep.* 362 and where the ideas it presents intersect with the two treatises: Basil’s *Homilia XXIV* and Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos*. For these, the enquiry returns to Hübner.

Hübner’s findings in *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* that bear directly upon the possible use of ideas in common between Basil of Caesarea, Apolinarius of

---

<sup>67</sup> Apolinarius, *Ep.* 362, in *PG* 32:1099-1108 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 203-204; English translation in Prestige, *St Basil*, 39-43. ...Οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ἀπομερισμὸς τοῦ προτέρου εἰς τὸ δευτερον ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σωμάτων, ἀλλ’ ἀπογέννησις. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ Πατρὸς ιδιότης καθάπερ εἰς Υἱὸν ἀπομεμερίσται, ἀλλ’ ἡ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπέφηνε· ταυτόν ἐν ἑτερότητι καὶ ἕτερον ἐν ταυτότητι, καθὼς λέγεται Πατέρα εἶναι ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ Υἱὸν ἐν Πατρί. Οὔτε γὰρ ἡ ἑτερότης ἀπλῶς φυλάξει τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς υἰότητος οὔτε ἡ ταυτότης αὐτὸ τὸ ἀμέριστον τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ἀλλ’ ἐκάτερον σύμπλοκον καὶ ἐνοειδές· ταυτόν ἑτέρως καὶ ἕτερον ὡσαύτως, ἵνα τις τὰ ῥήματα, μὴ ἐφικνούμενα τῆς δηλώσεως, ἐκβιάσῃται, βεβαιούντος ἡμῖν τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἔννοιαν καὶ ἐν τῷ μείζων μὲν ἰσότητι παριστάναι τὸν Πατέρα, τὸν δὲ Υἱὸν ἐν ὑποβάσει τὸ ἴσον ἔχοντα· ὅπερ ἐδίδαξεν ἐν ὁμοειδεῖ μὲν, ὑφειμένῳ δὲ φωτὶ νοεῖν τὸν Υἱὸν μὴ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐξαλλάττοντας, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπερβεβληκὸς καὶ ἐν ὑφέσει θεωροῦντας. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ ταυτότητι παραδεξάμενοι τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ἔξωθεν φέροντες τῷ Υἱῷ προστιθέασιν, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἕως ἀνθρώπων διαβαίνει τῶν ὁμοιομένων τῷ Θεῷ. Οἱ δὲ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τοῖς ποιήμασι πρέπουσαν εἰδότες ἐν ταυτότητι μὲν τὸν Υἱὸν συνάπτουσι Πατρί, ὑφειμένη δὲ τῇ ταυτότητι, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ἢ μέρος Πατρός, ἃ δυνατῶς παρίσταται τῷ «ἄλλος Υἱός», οὕτως Θεός, οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου, οὐ τὸ πρωτότυπον, ἀλλ’ εἰκὼν. Οὗτος ὁμοούσιος ἐξηρημένως παρὰ πάντα καὶ ἰδιαζόντως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ ὁμογενῆ, οὐχ ὡς τὰ ἀπομεριζόμενα, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς γένους καὶ εἵδους τῆς θεότητος ἐν καὶ μόνον ἀπογέννημα ἀδιαιρέτῳ καὶ ἀσωμάτῳ προόδῳ, καθ’ ἣν μένον τὸ γεννῶν ἐν τῇ γεννητικῇ ιδιότητι προῆλθεν εἰς τὴν γεννητὴν ιδιότητα.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Laodicea and Pseudo-Athanasius is summarized in these arguments, each taking a different view.

### *Theology*

Pertaining to the dating of *Contra Sabellianos*:

- 1) Considering Photinus as the main opponent of *Contra Sabellianos*, Hübner proposes a date range of 351 to 352 CE;
- 2) Regarding Apolinarius, the supposed author, he finds the years 358 to 363; and
- 3) Thinking of Basil, the assumed reader, he reckons a date of *circa* 360.

The Christology (in the early 360s) of Apolinarius is obviously already very developed, but the treatise does not yet entirely reveal the fixed Christological interest, different from Apolinarius' *Letter to the Emperor Jovian* dated from the year 363. In the sentence in *C. Sabellianos* 6 (108A): '...whoever says that there is an unbegotten (ageneton) God and another produced (genneton) God also teaches two gods because the difference of ousia which he introduces is blasphemous', can be an indication of the divisive controversy with Aetius or also Eunomius. The Trinitarian formula 'one ousia - three hypostases' is not met as such in *C. Sabellianos*, but the corresponding teaching of Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three persons in one ousia exists. The remarks in *C. Sabellianos* 7 (108C - 109A) on the eternal perfection of the Trinity, with which nothing could be summed created beings, such as the baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) proves, and which is beyond any 'authority and power and dominion' (cf *Eph.* 1:21) – in which no angel had been counted, seems to reveal an awareness of the confrontation with the Tropici. The argument of Athanasius in the *Letters to Serapion* is also terminologically and factually similar. And *C. Sabellianos* 12 (116C - 117A) on the common dwelling and the uniqueness of the *energeia* of the Trinity, which Athanasius argued in the same letters, is best understood as an echo of the controversy over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. All this taken together places them to about the years 358-363.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 249-250. Hier sind in der Hauptsache nur die Schlußfolgerungen aus den Daten zu ziehen, die sich im Laufe der Untersuchungen ergeben haben. Die Zeit der Abfassung läßt sich von mehreren Ansatzpunkten her einkreisen.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Hübner supposes that Basil has the tract *C. Sabellianos* at least while in the course of writing his books *Against Eunomius*, or about 360–364, but not before his request to Apolinarius [for a clarification of *homoousion*, which means same in substance] in the letter identified as number 361. And to Hübner, it is not improbable that Apolinarius has sent along with his written response [letter number 362] also the little treatise *Contra Sabellianos*. That he has sent an old work to Basil is not credible. So we reach the date 360. At the point where Basil's *Against Eunomius II* seems to use the tract of Apolinarius, and precisely in the interpretation of *John* 1:1 is an allusion to the Christology of Photinus: 'Not by Mary, he says (John), is the beginning, not from the time and, but what (he says)? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The existence since eternity, without suffering the begetting of the father... He conceived together in these few words...' So apparently Basil knows exactly who is the 'Samosatener' of the treatise, for he is in the first sentence of the quotation, which has no literal counterpart to recognize in the treatise. Basil shows no particular interest in the Christological question, rather he turns the argument against Eunomius. Now the attention of Basil for

---

1. Zunächst von Photin her gesehen. Seine Lehre hat sicher das Stadium der Entwicklung erreicht, das in den Texten von Sirmium (351) erkennbar ist. Da dort der anthropologische Vergleich der Trinität mit dem aus Geist, Seele, Leib zusammengesetzten Menschen noch nicht erwähnt wird, er aber doch so auffallend ist, daß man nicht verfehlt hätte, ihn anzuprangern, wenn Photin ihn von sich gegeben hätte, wird er ihn später entwickelt haben.

...2. Von Apolinarius her gesehen. Seine Christologie ist offensichtlich schon stark ausgeprägt; aber der Traktat zeigt noch nicht ausschließlich christologisches Interesse, wie es doch der fest datierbare Brief des Apolinarius an Kaiser Jovian aus dem Jahre 363 schon verrät. In dem Satz *c. Sabellianos* 6 (108A): "... wer sagt, daß es einen unerzeugten (*agenneton*) Gott gebe, und einen anderen erzeugten (*genneton*) Gott, auch der lehrt zwei Götter aufgrund des Unterschieds der *ousia*, den er blasphemisch einführt", kann man einen Hinweis auf die ausgebrochene Kontroverse mit Aëtius oder auch Eunomius erblicken. Die trinitarische Formel 'eine *ousia* – drei Hypostasen' begegnet als solche nicht, aber die sachlich entsprechende Lehre von Vater, Sohn und heiligem Geist als drei Personen in einer *ousia* ist vorhanden. Die Ausführungen *c. Sabellianos* 7 (108C – 109A) über die ewige Vollkommenheit der Trias, mit der nichts Geschöpfliches zusammengezählt werden könne, wie das der Taufbefehl (Mt 28,19) beweise, in dem "kein Prinzip, kein Gewalt, kein Kraft" (vgl Eph 1,21) – also kein Engel – mitgezählt worden sei, scheint Kenntnis der Auseinandersetzung mit den Tropikern zu verraten. Die Argumentation des Athanasius in den Serapionsbriefen ist sachlich und auch terminologisch ähnlich. Auch *c. Sabellianos* 12 (116C – 117A) über die gemeinsame Einwohnung und die Einzigkeit der *energeia* der Trias, die von Athanasius in denselben Briefen wiederholt beschworen werden, ist am ehesten als Widerhall des Streites um die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes zu verstehen. Das alles zusammengekommen läßt auf die Jahre zwischen 358 und 363 schließen.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Christological problems at no time is excessive, so this slight hint made here unfortunately cannot close a dispute with Photinus that had already been settled some time. It remains at about 360 as the *terminus ante quem* for the authorship of Apolinarius. To date it more precisely is not yet possible. If Athanasius' *Contra Arianos IV* and Basil's *Contra Eunomium IV* and *V* actually are works of Apolinarius, the date of composition perhaps will be narrowed closer. Hübner concludes this argument with the statement that for now one can just say that *Contra Sabellianos* probably was written in the years 358–360.<sup>69</sup>

A centrepiece of his thesis is where Hübner compares Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* with Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV, Contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomoeos*.<sup>70</sup> He presents his comparison of these two fourth-century treatises on pro-Nicene theology in seven proofs comprised of six parallel examples with a seventh example that calls out possible anomalies in wording. Hübner's six parallel examples show the following:

- 1) Text in Pseudo-Athanasius appears in Basil;
- 2) Where they use text in common, Basil's use of the text does not appear to follow as logically as it does in Pseudo-Athanasius;
- 3) In Pseudo-Athanasius, the use of text in common seems more complete and internally consistent than it does in Basil;
- 4) In the example of the parallel exegesis of certain passages from the *Gospel of John* [notably *John* 14.16-18], Pseudo-Athanasius seems to argue more to the point than does Basil;
- 5) In the use of Trinitarian terminology, thoughts and arguments a dependency is suspected but not obviously evident of Basil upon Pseudo-Athanasius; and
- 6) These observations of Hübner, taken together with Basil's apparent tentativeness in arguing for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, speaks for the priority of Pseudo-Athanasius' text over that of Basil.

---

<sup>69</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 250-251.

<sup>70</sup> Hübner, *Op. cit.*, 47-125.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Hübner's seventh example shows anomalies in Basil's wording, especially in Basil's unexpected use of the term *genemma*, which offended him when Eunomius employed it to support neo-Arian arguments.<sup>71</sup>

### *Drecol's counter-argument*

Volker Henning Drecol has been Professor of Church History with the Faculty of Tübingen since 2004, and he has worked extensively in Patristic Theology. In 1996, Drecol published his *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).<sup>72</sup> Drecol tells the story in rich detail of how Basil of Caesarea made the transition from his homoiousion formation to a more fully Nicene view. In Drecol's account, it is evident that Basil struggled to integrate the ideas of pro-Nicene writers, especially Athanasius of Alexandria, as they challenged his homoiousian view.<sup>73</sup> Drecol finds less influence on Basil by Apolinarius than is asserted by other authors, notably Reinhard M. Hübner.<sup>74</sup>

Other major works by Drecol include *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins* (Tübingen: 1999), *Der Passauer Vertrag (1552) – Einleitung und Edition* (Berlin: Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 79, 2000), *Pneumatologie in der Alten Kirche* (gemeinsam mit Wolf-Dieter Hauschild) (Bern: *Traditio Christiana* 12, 2004). This later work, *Pneumatologie in der Alten Kirche*, a collaborative effort with Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, features Drecol's keen interest in and extensive work with primary texts from the fourth century that serve as markers in the history and development of orthodox Pneumatology.

On the correspondence between Basil and Apolinarius, Drecol accepts the genuineness of *Epistulae* 361-364. He explains that the correspondence between Basil and Apolinarius is covered in very few manuscripts. The authenticity has been widely recognized in the investigations of Prestige and Riedmatten. Since the Trinitarian doctrine of Apolinarius for the period 360 (apart from *Epistulae* 362 and 364) is not well known, the case must be good for the authenticity above

---

<sup>71</sup> Hübner, *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> Drecol, Volker H. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner.* (Göttingen, 1996).

<sup>73</sup> Drecol, *Op. cit.*, 126-7.

<sup>74</sup> Drecol, *Op. cit.*, 42, 332-3.

all of *Epistula 361*. That *Epistula 361* represents the position of Basil seems likely, especially compared with his *Epistula I*. The expectant position in both letters clearly can also bring *Adversus Eunomium* into relationship so that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of *Epistulae 361-364* due to internal criteria. Basil had to face the mid-seventies occupied with the accusation of Eustathians that he had maintained contact with the heresiarch Apolinarius, based on the existence of this correspondence. To conclude from the facts that if *Epistula 361* belongs to Basil and *Epistulae 362* and *364* belong to Apolinarius, then *Epistula 363* should also be true, however, produces little for the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>75</sup>

Drecoll's findings in *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilios von Cäsarea* that bear directly upon the possible use of ideas in common between Basil of Caesarea and Pseudo-Athanasius will be summarized in the following.

### *Drecoll's objection to Hübner's assertion*

Drecoll begins by pointing out that Hübner is focused from the outset on only one of several [five alternative] possibilities to explain how Basil's and Pseudo-Athanasius' texts can be related. Instead of considering Basil's possible dependence on Apolinarius, Drecoll looks at these alternatives:<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-22. It should be noted here that Drecoll's comment on Hübner's use of *Epistulae 361-364*, while serving a critical purpose, passes over significant theological content, especially in *Epistula 364*. This content receives more attention later in this study.

<sup>76</sup> Drecoll, *Op. cit.*, 35-36. In Frage kommen insgesamt folgende Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse:

i.) *Homilia XXIV* ist von Ps-Ath abhängig.

Ps-Ath gehört doch Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* Basilios; *Homilia XXIV* wäre dann ein besonders starkes Zeugnis für den auch sonst bemerkbaren Athanasiusgebrauch des Basilios.

Ps-Ath gehört Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* nicht Basilios; *Homilia XXIV* wäre dann ein Zeugnis für die Wirkungsgeschichte des Alexandriners.

Ps-Ath gehört Apollinaris oder einem anderen Nizäner aus dem Umfeld des Athanasius; *Homilia XXIV* dagegen ist basilianisch. Diese These würde auch noch nicht bedeuten, daß die gesamte Trinitätslehre des Basilios von Ps-Ath abhängig ist, den so groß sind die Übereinstimmungen z-B zu AE nicht, daß *Homilia XXIV* vor AE anzusetzen wäre. Eine solche Frühdatierung von *Homilia XXIV* erscheint eher unwahrscheinlich.

Ps-Ath gehört nicht Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* nicht Basilios. Die Klärung der Abhängigkeit zwischen beiden Werken hätte für die Analyse der basilianischen Trinitätslehre gar keine Bedeutung.

ii.) Ps-Ath ist ein Traktat, der *Homilia XXIV* benutzt. *Homilia XXIV* ist basilianisch oder ps-basilianisch und wird von einem Apollinaristen bei der Verfertigung eines grundsätzlicheren Traktats miteingebaut. Eine athanasianische Verfasserschaft scheidet dann wohl aus (denn *Homilia XXIV* ist wohl nach 373 anzusetzen); Apollinaris als Verfasser ist unwahrscheinlich, wenn auch nicht unmöglich.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

### i.) *Homilia XXIV* depends on Ps.-Ath.

Ps.-Ath. is yet Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is Basilian; *Homilia XXIV* would be a very strong testimony to the otherwise too noticeable Athanasian tradition of Basil.

Ps.-Ath. is by Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is not by Basil; *Homilia XXIV* would be part of the reception of Athanasius.

Ps.-Ath. is by Apolinarius or another pro-Nicene amongst the followers of Athanasius; *Homilia XXIV*, however, is Basilian. This thesis would not mean that the whole doctrine of the Trinity of Basil is Ps.-Ath.-dependent, the similarities are not so great with the *Contra Eunomium* that it would put *Homilia XXIV* before *C. Eunom.* Such early dating for *Homilia XXIV* appears unlikely.

Ps.-Ath. is not by Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is not by Basil. Clarifying the relationship between the two works would not add meaning to the Basilian Trinity.

ii.) Ps.-Ath. is a treatise using *Homilia XXIV*. *Homilia XXIV* is Basilian or Ps.-Basilian and is constructed by an Apolinarist. An Athanasian authorship is excluded and *Homilia XXIV* then dates after 373); Apolinarius as the author is unlikely if not impossible.

According to Drecoll, these other four possible explanations need not be excluded, especially since the last of these options has a lot of merit. Under the heading *De amuletis* the *Codex Reg.* 2423, folio 150 a.o. quotes from Ps.-Ath (PG 26:1320f), and indeed it is the passage where Ps.-Ath. and *Homilia XXIV* match, namely Ps.-Ath., 109AC. The citation contains first 109C, then 109A, quoting in reverse order, leaving mainly the Bible quotations out, the wording of it is closer to Ps.-Ath. than to *Homilia XXIV*. That a match between *Homilia XXIV* and Ps.-Ath. has been handed down, and is found in Ps.-Ath. extended by several Bible quotes, makes it possible that Ps.-Ath. 109ABC is the later incorporation of an isolated fragment, which is derived from *Homilia XXIV*.<sup>77</sup> This fits well with the observation that in Ps.-Ath. only four points (97CD; 116BC; 100CD; 109AC) touch *Homilia XXIV*. 109ABC is also comparable to 116BC, when the passage of the match in *Homilia XXIV* and Ps.-Ath. derives largely by way of the extensive quotation from 2 *Corinthians* 3:18. 100C also contains quotes from the Bible more than the corresponding passage in *Homilia*

---

<sup>77</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 35-37, 138-140.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

XXIV. There is need therefore to consider the possibility that Ps.-Ath. in its present form is confused with another Ps.-Athanasius (*Peri tes tou Yiou aidiou hyparxeos tou Yiou kai tou Pneumatos syn Theou*) with fragments from *Homilia XXIV* (+ *kai pros tous Sabellizontas?*); such a confusion is attested for *Homilia XXV* with *Homilia XXIII*. This possibility is more probable than the supposition of Hübner that in 375, when the Eustathians accused Basil of Sabellianism because of his former contacts with Apolinarius, Basil as a bishop and trained rhetorician answered by challenging the validity of the evidence the Eustathians claimed to have against him by using and quoting Apolinarius.<sup>78</sup>

### *Hübner's and Drecoll's Findings*

What possible implications can be drawn from the findings of Hübner and Drecoll that bear upon late fourth-century development of orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit?

Hübner makes reference to the correspondence between Apolinarius and Basil of Caesarea (*Epistulae* 361-362 in *PG* 32:1099-1108) with a view to establishing two facts: 1) a direct use of ideas in common between the writers on the 'divine ousia', and 2) to establish the latest probable date for the exchange of Basil's request (letter number 361) to Apolinarius and Apolinarius' answer (letter number 362) to Basil.<sup>79</sup> This will receive more attention later in this study to determine what significance it has for the development of teaching on the Holy Spirit.

In Hübner's findings it is constructive to note the affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where Pseudo-Athanasius [Hübner's 'Apolinarius'] in *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*: 1) The baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) is cited to show that the Holy Spirit is with the Trinity and no created things can be added to the Trinity;

2) Although the teaching on the Holy Spirit is not overly developed yet in *Contra Sabellianos*, for example, the Spirit is not called 'image of the Son' but is considered to be the 'Spirit of the Son'. As such, he reveals the form of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Drecoll, *Op. cit.*, 35-37.

<sup>79</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Godhead, which has its origin in the Father and shines forth in the Son [Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.* 11, 12 (11B-C)].<sup>80</sup>

Hübner's assertion that Pseudo-Athanasius is actually Apolinarius is interesting, but with Drecoll, at least, remains unproven. His finding that there was a use of ideas in common about the Holy Spirit between Pseudo-Athanasius in *Contra Sabellianos* and Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* appears to be suggested by the evidence. If these documents were produced in the early 360s and within one to three years of each other then the apparent inclusion of the principles and ideas in Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* would suggest some of these ideas are used in common between Pseudo-Athanasius and Athanasius. These ideas support part of the argument in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* and, as such, are significant to the development of pro-Nicene teaching on the Holy Spirit.

Drecoll focuses on ideas used in common between Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea, and as such does not delve into a similarity of ideas between Athanasius and Apolinarius, since he has shown that there is no great influence of Apolinarius on Basil in the 360s, then perhaps it can be inferred that Drecoll sees very little common use of ideas between Athanasius and Apolinarius.

### ***Topics not argued by Hübner and Drecoll***

Hübner argues for the similarity of ideas between Pseudo-Athanasius (and Apolinarius) and both Basil and Athanasius. Where Hübner has the force of historical scholarship with him, he argues for the influence of Apolinarius upon Basil and Athanasius.<sup>81</sup> His view is of a movement of ideas from Apolinarius outward. Hübner assumes the primacy of the ideas of Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius over those of Basil and Athanasius. An example of where this view can leave scholars in a quandary is with the *Epistulae* 361-364 between Basil and Apolinarius. While the authenticity and authorship of these letters is gaining acceptance amongst modern scholars, the order of these letter is by no means settled.<sup>82</sup> It specifically served Hübner's purpose to make a brief mention of these letters. There is interesting theological content in this correspondence,

---

<sup>80</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 242, 247-250.

<sup>81</sup> Hübner, *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-28.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

specifically in *Epistula 364*, which has implications for the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit and so bears closer examination.<sup>83</sup>

Apollinaris [*sic*] to my master and longed-for brother Basil, greeting in the Lord. Think of the situation in which I have been myself, master, and say what has happened to your longed-for voice or the normal letter. Why do you not come to our help in person or at least shout encouragement from afar, since this great war has broken out against orthodoxy, and we are like men in the middle of the battle-front, calling to our friends owing to the violence shown by the enemy? As for you, we have no means of seeking you out, since we cannot discover where you may happen to be staying. I inquired for you in the city of the Cappadocians, as a report came from people who had met you in Pontus that you had announced your intention to return there shortly; but I did not find you where I hoped. But now on hearing that you are still staying in the same parts I have immediately entrusted this letter to my informant. When you receive it, do not make his departure in your company a reason for not replying.

Let me tell you that in the meantime a visit has been paid us by bishops coming from Egypt, and a letter [Athanasius' *Ep. ad Jov.*] has been distributed in harmony with ancient formularies, both those of divine authority and those drawn up at Nicaea in unison with these. It was necessary to take up the same points again, together with an explanation, owing to the fallacious misinterpretation of established decisions. This used formerly to be expressed in flat contradictions, but nowadays they dissemble the contradiction by a pretence of interpretation. Hence came that malicious suppression of the *homoousion* on the ground that, on any Greek interpretation, the concept is inappropriate; and the introduction, instead of the *homo[i]ousion*, of "similar in substance". This has been deliberately invented, though the terminology is slovenly and the meaning is ill-intentioned; for similarity applies to qualities inhering in the substance, not to substantive objects. The motive is to suggest a substance that bears the same sort of similarity that a statue might bear to the Emperor.

In reply to this the letter said – as would naturally be said by people of orthodox understanding and intention – that the *homoousion* declares the Son to be, not similar to God, but God, as being a genuine offspring and of the same substance as his begetter. The subject of the Spirit was introduced at the same time, to the effect that

---

<sup>83</sup> Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1956).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the fathers included him in the same confession of faith as the Father and the Son, because he has his being in the same deity.

Who was so obvious a person to act as spokesman for this orthodox view as your most worthy self, together with my master Gregory? – who likewise writes no letter from any address and sends no single piece of information. Farewell, most longed-for master.<sup>84</sup>

In *Epistula* 364, Apolinarius attests to the emergence of debate and doctrinal definition on the nature and being of the Holy Spirit. This receives more attention later in this enquiry.

Returning to the discussion of Hübner and Drecoll, it is noted that Drecoll identifies Basil's diversion from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification.<sup>85</sup> This diversion towards an emphasis on the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification is discernible in both Basil and Athanasius, albeit from divergent starting points, and is a promising area for further study. It is compelling to explore what influences were at work to bring each of them to that view. Drecoll explores and describes Basil's struggle to

---

<sup>84</sup> Apolinarius, Ep. 364, in *PG* 32:1099-1108 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 203-204; English translation in Prestige, *St Basil*, 39-43. Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ ποθεινοτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ Βασιλείῳ Ἀπολινάριος ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν. Ποῦ μὲν ἤμην αὐτός, δέσποτα, ποῦ δὲ ἡ ποθεινοτάτη φωνὴ καὶ γράμμα τὸ σὺνηθες; Τί δὲ οὐ παρὼν ἀμύνεις ἢ καὶ ἀπὼν παρακελεύεις, πολέμου τοσούτου κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἔρρωγός τε καὶ ἡμῶν οἷον ἐν μέσῃ παρατάξει βοώντων πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν πολέμιων βίαν; Σὲ δὲ οὐδ' ὅπως ἂν ζητήσωμεν ἔχομεν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ οὐ τυγχάνεις διατρίβων εὐρίσκομεν. Ἀλλ' ἐζήτησα μὲν ἐν τῇ Καππαδοκίᾳ, ἐπεὶ καὶ οὕτως ἡγγελλον οἱ ἐν Πόντῳ σοι περιτυχόντες ἐπηγγέλθαι σε θάττον ἐπανήξειν, οὐχ εὖρον δὲ ἔνθα ἤλπιζον. Νῦν δὲ ἔτι σε κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάγοντα χώραν ἀκούσας εὐθὺς τῷ μηνυτῇ καὶ τὸ γράμμα ἐνεχείρισα. Ὅπερ δεξάμενος μὴ καὶ τοῦ ἀντιγράφειν ἀπόσχῃ ὥς καὶ τοῦτου συναποδημούντος. Ἰσθι δὲ ὡς ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ γέγονεν ἐπισκόπων ἐπιδημία τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ γράμματα διεδόθη σύμφωνα παλαιοῖς γράμμασιν τοῖς τε θείοις αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς καθ' ὁμοφωνίαν τῶν θείων ἐν Νικαίᾳ γραφεῖσιν. Ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἦν ἡ μετ' ἐξηγήσεως τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπανάληψις, διὰ τὴν οὐχ ὑγιῇ τῶν κειμένων παρεξήγησιν ἣν εἰσήγον οἱ πάλαι μὲν ἄντικρυς ἀντιλέγοντες, νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν ἐξηγήσεως σχήματι μεθοδεύσαντες. ἔνθα ἦν ἡ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου κακοῦργος ἀναίρεσις ὡς οὐκ ὀφείλοντος νοεῖσθαι κατ' οὐδεμίαν ἄρνησιν Ἑλληνικῇ ἀντισταγωγῇ δὲ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὸ ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν, ὅπερ ἐπετηδεύθη χυδαίως ὀνομασθέν καὶ κακοήθως νοηθέν, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ὁμοιότης τῶν ἐν οὐσίᾳ ἐστίν, οὐ τῶν οὐσιωδῶν, ἵνα δὴ οὕτως ὁμοιωμένη οὐσία νοῆται, οἷος ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀνδριάς πρὸς Βασιλέα. Πρὸς ἅπερ ἀντεγράφη τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν εὐσεβεῖν εἰδότες καὶ βουλομένων, ὅτι οὐχ ὅμοιον Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν δηλοῖ τὸ ὁμοούσιον, ὡς ἂν γέννημα γνήσιον καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τῷ γεγεννηκότι. Συνεισήγετο δὲ καὶ τὸ περὶ Πνεύματος ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν Πατέρων ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πίστει τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ κειμένου, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ θεότητι. Τὴν οὖν τῆς εὐσεβείας ταύτης πρεσβείαν τίνα εἰκὸς ἦν οὕτω μετεῖναι ὡς τὸν σπουδαιότατον ἅμα τῷ δεσπότῃ μου Γρηγορίῳ, ὃς οὐδ' αὐτὸς οὐδαμῶθεν γράφει οὐδὲ σημαίνει καθάπαξ οὐδέν; Ἐρρωσο, δέσποτα ποθεινότατε.

<sup>85</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 138-140.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

move from a homoiousian tradition and view towards a new and impactful understanding of the Holy Spirit. What is open for further study is to trace what and who enabled Basil to arrive at that view and to compare his understanding of the role and nature of the Holy Spirit with that of his mentors and contemporaries.

Drecoll seems to say that in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* Athanasius directs his lengthy argument from Christology only to those opponents to a divine Holy Spirit who were not influenced by neo-Arian ideas;<sup>86</sup> and, as such, Drecoll does not offer a reason why Athanasius would have done so. In making this assumption about Athanasius' opponents, it is possible that Drecoll rules out a few promising reasons why Athanasius might have chosen to argue labouriously from Christology for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. With Athanasius, as with Basil, it is equally compelling to explore what influences were at work to bring him to his emergent view of the role and nature of the Holy Spirit.

As can be seen in the findings to this point, neither Hübner nor Drecoll have looked far beyond the proponents of a divine Holy Spirit in the exploration of the development of ideas on the theology of the Holy Spirit in the fourth century. In what follows, this study shall try to identify the early traces of this second stage of the development of doctrine on the Trinity, which followed the working out of the relation between the Father and Son.

---

<sup>86</sup> Drecoll, *Ibid.*

## ***Chapter 2: The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Century***

In 358, the synods called by Emperor Constantius had gathered western bishops at Ariminum and eastern bishops at Seleucia with the intent to settle doctrinal disputes and bring unity and peace to the Church. The proponents of Arian and Homoian ideas were keen to set aside any creedal use of the term ‘ousios’ (substance, essence) either as ‘homousios’ (same substance) or ‘homoiousios’ (like substance), ostensibly for the reasons that it confuses people who do not understand what ‘ousios’ means, when applied to God the Father and Jesus Christ, and it is not drawn directly from Scripture. The reign of Constantius offered a political climate favourable to those who would dispense with the *homousios*. Strife ensued at both synods, in the midst of which a replacement creed emerged.<sup>87</sup> The so-called ‘Second Sirmium Creed’ of 357 was unveiled at Ariminum. As an attempt to remove creedal use of the term ‘ousios’ it failed. Yet, it was successful in an unexpected way. It contributed to the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit.<sup>88</sup>

[We believe] also in the Holy Spirit, whom the only-begotten Son of God Jesus Christ himself promised to send to the human race as the Comforter, according to that which is written: “I go away to my Father, and will ask him, and he will send you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth. He shall receive of mine, and shall teach you, and bring all things to your remembrance.” (*Jn.* 14:16-17, 16:14)

At the synod, and in the tumult of the moment, this detailed exposition on the Holy Spirit – one that went beyond the brief statement ‘and in the Holy Spirit’ of the Nicene Creed – was missed when the proponents threw down the gauntlet in the words that immediately followed.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> See M. Barnes and D. Williams, *Arianism after Arius* (Edinburgh 1993) and Brennecke, H. C., *Hilarius von Poitiers* (Berlin 1984).

<sup>88</sup> ‘Sirmium Creed’ read at Ariminum (ca 359) was proposed by Acacius of Caesarea. Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:37, 61-62. John 14:16-17, 16:14. Maraval, P. and Périchon, P., *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique* (Livres I-VII) (Paris 2004/2007): 477: 44-262; 493: 18-258; 505:22-354; 506:20-158. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὃ αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπηγγείλατο πέμψαι τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν παράκλητον κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ‘ἀπέρχομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ παρακαλέσω τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον πέμψει ὑμῖν, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας· ἐκεῖνος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται καὶ διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα.’

<sup>89</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:37, 62. Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς οὐσίας διὰ τὸ ἀπλούστερον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων τεθεῖσθαι, ἀγνοούμενον δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν λαῶν

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

As for the term “substance,” which was used by our fathers [at Nicaea] for the sake of greater simplicity, but not being understood by the people has caused offense on account of the fact that the Scriptures do not contain it, it seemed desirable that it should be wholly abolished, and that in future no mention should be made of substance in reference to God, since the divine Scriptures have nowhere spoken concerning the substance of the Father and the Son. But we say that the Son is in all things *like* the Father, as the Holy Scriptures affirm and teach.

The tumult of controversy over the “substance” of God raised conflicting themes voiced by a group of prominent Christian writers in the twenty-year period from 358 to 378, which followed some earlier debates from the years after Nicaea. This enquiry now turns to the writers from those decades after Nicaea for a closer look at their roles in the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit.

### *Asterius of Cappadocia*

From Cappadocia in Asia Minor, an Hellenistic rhetorician named Asterius had converted to Christianity and wrote treatises in support of Arian doctrine.<sup>90</sup> He first came to prominence in Syria, where, at the behest of Eusebius of Caesarea and his party (also referred to as ‘Eusebians’), he toured the cities to deliver public readings of his texts. He became known in his time for asserting that Jesus Christ is an instance of the power of God in the same way that Moses described the locust and caterpillar as instances of the power of God (on *Joel* 2:25). His activities came to the attention of Bishop Marcellus of Ancyra who, in an attempt to oppose him, wrote counter-arguments that were interpreted by those who defended Asterius as bearing hints of the Samosatene and Sabellian heresies. Asterius was not a presbyter and so had little to risk in presenting his views; Marcellus being a bishop, however, exposed himself to the risk of deposition.<sup>91</sup>

---

σκάνδαλον φέρειν διὰ τὸ μήτε τὰς γραφὰς τοῦτο περιέχειν, ἤρρεσεν τοῦτο περὶ αἰρεθῆναι καὶ παντελῶς μηδεμίαν μνῆμην οὐσίας ἐπὶ Θεοῦ εἶναι τοῦ λοιποῦ διὰ τὸ τὰς θείας γραφὰς μηδαμοῦ περὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ οὐσίας μεμνησθαι. Ὅμοιον δὲ λέγομεν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα, ὡς αἱ ἅγιοι γραφαὶ λέγουσιν τε καὶ διδάσκουσιν.»

<sup>90</sup> On Asterius, see Wolfram Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius*, FKDG 47 (Göttingen 1990); his surviving fragments are collected in Markus Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien: Die theologischen Fragmente. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Leiden a.o., 1993).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>91</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. I*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:33.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

According to Athanasius of Alexandria (*De Synodis. NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:459-60) Asterius of Cappadocia was a ‘many-headed Sophist, one of the fellows of Eusebius [of Caesarea], whom they [Eusebians] could not advance into the Clergy, his having done pagan sacrifice in the former persecution in the time of Constantius’ grandfather [Decius].’ Athanasius complains bitterly that, urged on by ‘Eusebius [of Caesarea] and his fellows’, Asterius wrote a work tailored to their purposes in which ‘after comparing, or rather preferring, the locust and the caterpillar to Christ, ...[said that God] was the Framer of Christ as of the world’, and then Asterius travelled in Syria and elsewhere as a featured spokesperson for the Eusebians. Athanasius goes on to comment upon and quote excerpts from the writings of Asterius.<sup>92</sup>

For the Blessed Paul said not that he preached Christ, His, that is, God’s ‘own Power’ or ‘Wisdom,’ but without the article, ‘God’s Power and God’s Wisdom’ (1 *Cor.* 1:24), preaching that the own power of God Himself was distinct, which was con-natural and co-existent with Him unoriginately, generative indeed of Christ, creative of the whole world; concerning which he teaches in his Epistle to the Romans, thus, ‘The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and divinity’ (*Rom.* 1:20). For as no one would say that the Deity there mentioned was Christ, but the Father Himself, so, as I think, His eternal power is also not the Only-begotten God (*Jn.* 1:18), but the Father who begat Him. And he tells us of another Power and Wisdom of God, namely, that which is manifested through Christ, and made known through the works themselves of His Ministry.’

---

<sup>92</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis. NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:459-60. Asterius fragment 64 in Markus Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien: Die theologischen Fragmente. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Leiden a.o., 1993), 124. οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἢ τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ δίχα τῆς προσθήκης <δύναμιν θεοῦ καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν>, ἄλλην μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν, τὴν ἔμφυτον αὐτῷ καὶ συνυπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ ἀγενήτως κηρύσσων, γεννητικὴν μὲν οὖσαν, δηλονότι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δημιουργικὴν δὲ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου. περὶ ἧς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ διδάσκων ἔλεγε· <τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται ἢ τε αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης>. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὴν εἰρημένην ἐνταυθοῖ θεότητα οὐκ ἂν τις φαίη Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν τὸν πατέρα, οὕτως, οἶμαι, καὶ ἡ αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύναμις οὐχ ὁ μονογενὴς θεός, ἀλλ’ ὁ γεννήσας ὑπάρχει πατήρ. ἄλλην δὲ δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν διδάσκει θεοῦ τὴν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δεικνυμένην δηλονότι καὶ διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν τῆς διακονίας αὐτοῦ γνωριζομένην. See H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* (1940) 231-278. See also, G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Lucien d’Antioche et son École* (1936).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Another excerpt from Asterius states.<sup>93</sup>

Although His eternal Power and Wisdom, which truth argues to be Unbegun and Ingenerate, would appear certainly to be one and the same, yet many are those powers which are one by one created by Him, of which Christ is the First-born and Only-begotten. All however equally depend upon their Possessor, and all His powers are rightly called His, who created and uses them; for instance, the Prophet says that the locust, which became a divine punishment of human sin, was called by God Himself, not only a power of God, but a great power (*Joel 2:25*). And the blessed David too in several of the Psalms, invites, not Angels alone, but Powers also to praise God. And while he invites them all to the hymn, he presents before us their multitude, and is not unwilling to call them ministers of God, and teaches them to do His will.

Asterius, in an interpretation of Origen, developed a doctrine that the Son, as Word, was 'like' the Father. Asterius taught that the Father and the Son are of different substances [*hypostases*] and that both the Son and Holy Spirit are part of the created order, with the subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Son.

Enjoying the support and encouragement of the Eusebians, Asterius actively engaged in popularising his teaching throughout much of Asia Minor and Syria.

Despite Asterius' close affinity in expression with the group around Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea (the *Eusebii* or 'Eusebians'), for example, when he describes the Father and the Son as having different substances [*hypostases*], Asterius is credited with making these statements on the Holy Spirit:

1)...what was this which came down before the incarnation? Surely, I [Marcellus] suppose, he [Asterius] says, Spirit.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis*. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:459-60. Opitz, *Op. cit.* 'καίτοιγε ἡ μὲν αἰδὶος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ σοφία, ἦν ἀναρχόν τε καὶ ἀγέννητον οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποφαίνονται λογισμοί, μία ἂν εἴη δῆπουθεν καὶ ἡ αὐτή, πολλαὶ δὲ αἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτισθεῖσαι, ὧν πρωτότοκος καὶ μονογενὴς ὁ Χριστός· πᾶσαι γε μὴν ὁμοίως εἰς τὸν κεκτημένον ἀνήρτηνται καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ χρωμένου καλοῦνται δικαίως. οἷον ὁ μὲν προφήτης <τὴν ἀκρίδα> δίκην τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων θεήλατον γινομένην οὐ <δύναμιν> μόνον θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ <μεγάλην> φησὶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ γε μακάριος Δαυὶδ ἐν πλείοσι τῶν ψαλμῶν οὐκ ἀγγέλοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ <δυνάμεσιν> αἰνεῖν παρακαλεῖται τὸν θεόν· καὶ πάσας γε ἐπὶ τὸν ὕμνον παρακαλῶν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος παρίστησι καὶ <λειτουργοὺς θεοῦ> καλεῖν οὐ παραιτεῖται καὶ <ποιεῖν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα> διδάσκει.'



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

2)...the Holy Spirit, as even Asterius confessed, proceeds from the Father [on *John* 15:26],<sup>95</sup>

3)...[in reference to *Matt.* 28:19] it is necessary to think that the Father is truly Father and that the Son is truly Son and likewise [regarding] the Holy Spirit<sup>96</sup>

4)...neither rightly nor also appropriately did he [Asterius] say that there are three hypostases, and that [statement] not once but even a second time.<sup>97</sup>

An interpretation of Asterius' statements on the Holy Spirit follows in the order in which they are presented:

- 1) Asterius (as he is portrayed by Marcellus of Ancyra) observes that before the Incarnation of the Son, God acted in the world by way of the Holy Spirit.
- 2) Asterius acknowledges that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father [on *John* 15:23]. Yet, this does not mean that Asterius views the Holy Spirit as being eternally in the Godhead. Rather, Asterius, like his colleagues the Eusebians, regards the Holy Spirit as a created being, granted inclusion in the Trinity with a status subordinate to the Son.
- 3) Asterius apparently sees the fulfilment of the baptismal commission [*Matt.* 28:19] as necessarily involving the work of the Holy Spirit. He asserts the role of the Holy Spirit in baptism by stating that, like the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is 'truly' Holy Spirit. And by 'truly' he means to say that the Holy Spirit has to have his own substance or hypostasis as the Son and the Father have theirs.

---

<sup>94</sup> Asterius fragment 58 in M. Vinzent, *Asterius* (1993), 120. Fragment 54 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, in E. Klostermann and G.C. Hansen, *Eusebius Werke* (1972), 194. τί τοίνυν ἦν τὸ κατελθὸν τοῦτο πρὸ τοῦ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι; πάντως πού φησιν πνεῦμα.

<sup>95</sup> Asterius frg. 59 in M. Vinzent, *Asterius* (1993), 120. Frg. 67 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, in Klostermann and Hansen, *Eusebius Werke* (1972), 197. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὡς καὶ Ἀστέριος ὁμολόγησεν, παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.

<sup>96</sup> Asterius frg. 60 in M. Vinzent, *Asterius* (1993), 120. Frg. 65 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, in Klostermann and Hansen, *Eusebius Werke* (1972), 197. ἔφη γὰρ τὸν μὲν πατέρα δεῖν ἀληθῶς πατέρα εἶναι νομίζειν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὡσαύτως.

<sup>97</sup> Asterius frg. 61 in M. Vinzent, *Asterius* (1993), 120. Frg. 69 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, in Klostermann and Hansen, *Eusebius Werke* (1972), 198. οὐκ ὀρθῶς οὖν οὐδὲ προσηκόντως εἶρηκεν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις εἶναι φήσας οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

- 4) Asterius views God the Father as supreme in nature with the Son and the Holy Spirit as different and subordinate in substance due to their sequential derivation in the hierarchy of beings.

In these statements on the Holy Spirit, it is possible to see that Asterius attempts to rationalise what is written in Scripture with the presuppositions of the worldview he brings with him from Middleplatonian philosophy. For Asterius, when there can be only one God of perfect nature, any being coming after God must be of a different and less perfect nature. So, to fit this view to Scripture, Asterius describes a Trinity of the non-generated Father, the unmediatedly generated (or created) Son, and the Holy Spirit created with the help of the Son.<sup>98</sup>

### *Marcellus of Ancyra*

By the year 358 Marcellus of Ancyra had endured a long and difficult career as a veteran combatant for Nicaea, allied with Athanasius of Alexandria, in the struggle against Arianism. Amongst his efforts he had participated in the Council of Nicaea, authored a book, the title of which is not clear (*Against Asterius?*),<sup>99</sup> opposing the ideas of Asterius of Cappadocia and his colleagues, the two *Eusebii* mentioned earlier, with Euphronius, Narcissus, and Paulinus. He gave his support to Athanasius of Alexandria at the synods of Tyre and Jerusalem in 335. Shortly after, at a synod at Constantinople in 336, he was deposed at the hands of the Eusebians and spent the early 340s in Rome, where he managed with the help of bishop Julius to reinforce his orthodoxy in the faith.<sup>100</sup> Unfortunately, Marcellus' return by edict of Constantius to his see at Ancyra was not a happy one. Sozomenus reports that 'There was a great tumult at Ancyra on the deposition of Basil from the church there, and the reinstallation of Marcellus.'<sup>101</sup> And very early in the next book Sozomenus says, 'The emperor [Constantius], deceived by the calumnies of the heterodox [Eusebians], changed his mind, and, in opposition to the decrees of Sardica, exiled the bishops whom he had previously restored.'

---

<sup>98</sup> See M. Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien* (1993), 40-51.

<sup>99</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:281. See M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra* (1997), XIV-XXV.

<sup>100</sup> R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (2005), 217-235.

<sup>101</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.* III, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:300.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Marcellus was again deposed, and Basil re-acquired possession of the bishopric of Ancyra.<sup>102</sup>

In his *Apologia Contra Arianos*, Athanasius defends his pro-Nicene compatriot Marcellus of Ancyra.

The book of our fellow-minister Marcellus was also read, by which the fraud of Eusebius [of Caesarea] and his fellows was plainly discovered. For what Marcellus had advanced by way of enquiry, they falsely represented as his professed opinion; but when the subsequent parts of the book were read, and the parts preceding the queries themselves, his faith was found to be correct. He had never pretended, as they positively affirmed, that the Word of God had His beginning from holy Mary, nor that His Kingdom had an end; on the contrary he had written that His kingdom was both without beginning and without end. Our fellow-minister Asclepas [of Gaza] also produced Reports which had been drawn up at Antioch in the presence of his accusers and Eusebius of Caesarea, and proved that he was innocent by the declarations of the Bishops who judged his cause...<sup>103</sup>

In his arguments against Asterius and his teachings, Marcellus appeals to the witness of the Holy Spirit to challenge Asterius' notion of the nature of Christ.

You hear, then, the consistent testimony of the Holy Spirit, giving witness through many and diverse persons to the eternity of the Word. And because of this he begins from the eternity of the Word, saying "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God." Using three successive testimonies, he wishes to show the eternity of the Word.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl. IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:301.

<sup>103</sup> Athanasius, *Defence Against the Arians*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:125. Opitz, *Op. cit.* Ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ καὶ τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦ συλλειτουργοῦ Μαρκελλοῦ καὶ ἠυρέθη τῶν περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἢ κακοτεχνία. ἃ γὰρ ὡς ζητῶν ὁ Μάρκελλος εἶρηκε, ταῦτα ὡς ὁμολογούμενα διαβεβλήκασιν. ἀνεγνώσθη γοῦν τὰ ἐξῆς καὶ τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν τῶν ζητημάτων, καὶ ὀρθὴ ἡ πίστις τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εὐρέθη. οὔτε γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας, ὡς αὐτοὶ διεβεβαίωσαντο, ἀρχὴν ἐδίδου τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ οὔτε τέλος ἔχειν τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀναρχον καὶ ἀτελεύτητον εἶναι τὴν τούτου ἔγραψε.

<sup>104</sup> Marcellus fragment 6 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 10. Fragment 53 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 194. ἀκούεις τοίνυν τῆς συμφωνίας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, διὰ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων προσώπων τῇ τοῦ λόγου μαρτυρούσης αἰδιότητι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἄρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰδιότητος τοῦ λόγου, «ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος» λέγων «καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος». τρισὶν ἐπαλλήλοις μαρτυρίαις χρώμενος τὴν αἰδιότητα τοῦ λόγου δεικνύναι βούλεται. *John* 1:1.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In this, Marcellus presents the Holy Spirit attesting through the prophets and apostles the eternity of the Word. By contrast, Marcellus' conception of the *monas* prior to creation, which then broadens into a *trias* during creation, poses difficulties for describing the divine nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Marcellus' reversal against Asterius' statement on the one hand that the Son is 'the same',<sup>105</sup> as the Father and on the other that they are different substances [*hypostases*] places the Holy Spirit within the Trinity bearing witness to the eternal being of the Word. Marcellus invokes the Holy Spirit by way of the prophet Isaiah to reassert the Word's being in the Godhead.

But the Father must be in the Word, even if it does not seem so to Asterius and to those who think the same things as he does. For this is the opinion of the divine prophet Isaiah, who says through the Holy Spirit: "And they will bow down to you and they will make supplication to you; because God is in you and there is no other beside you. For you are God." [Isaiah 45:14-15] You see how completely he refutes the crafty malice of those who teach differently.<sup>106</sup>

For Marcellus, God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit who are not divided into different substances [*hypostases*] as Asterius proposes:

It is impossible that three who are *hypostases* should be united in a Monad, unless the Trinity has first had its origin in a Monad. The holy Paul said that they were summed up in a Monad (Eph. 1:10), and this is no different from the unity which is God; the *Logos* and Spirit are only distinct from God in unity.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Asterius fragment in Athanasius, *De Synodis*. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:459-60. Opitz, *Op. cit.* 'Although His [Christ's] eternal Power and Wisdom, which truth argues to be Unbegun and Ingenerate, would appear certainly to be one and the same [with those of the Father], yet many are those powers which are one by one created by Him [the Father], of which Christ is the First-born and Only-begotten.'

<sup>106</sup> Marcellus frg. 95 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 84. Frg. 55 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 194. 'ἀλλ' ἔοικεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὁ πατὴρ εἶναι, κἂν Ἀστερίῳ μὴ δοκῇ καὶ τοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκείνῳ φρονοῦσιν. δοκεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο τῷ θεσπεσίῳ προφήτῃ Ἡσαΐα, τῷ δι' ἁγίου λέγοντι πνεύματος «καὶ προσκυνήσουσίν σοι, καὶ ἐν σοὶ προσεύξονται· ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν σοῦ. σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ θεός.» ὁρᾷς ὅπως πρόρριζον ἀνατρέπει τὴν τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκαλούντων ἐντεχνον κακουργίαν.'

<sup>107</sup> Marcellus frg. 47 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 42. Frg. 66 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 197. 'ἀδύνατον γὰρ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις οὕσας ἐνοῦσθαι μονάδι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἢ τριάς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ μονάδος ἔχῃ. ἐκεῖνα γὰρ

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In the above statement from Marcellus, there is a clear assertion that both the Word and the Spirit have their being in the one Godhead.

By considering the procession of the Holy Spirit, Marcellus attempts to show the flaws in Asterius' conception of three different substances [*hypostases*] for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit:

But if the gospel [says] that, having breathed upon the disciples, [Christ] said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," [*Jn. 20:20*] it is clear that the Spirit came forth from the Word. How then, if the Spirit came forth from the Word "does" the same "proceed from the Father"?<sup>108</sup> Therefore neither rightly nor also appropriately did he [Asterius] say that there are three hypostases, and that [statement] not once but even a second time."<sup>109</sup>

The basis for Marcellus' counter-argument is, of course, Asterius' assumption of the three different hypostases. Given that the Spirit comes forth from the Word or the Son, but the Word and Son is not of the same substance (hypostasis) as the Father, Marcellus counters, then the Spirit could not proceed from the Father, but one would need to say that he proceeded from the Son or Word instead. Yet, Scripture attributes the procession of the Spirit to Christ, the Son and Word, as shown in *Jn 20:20*. For Marcellus, this clearly shows that all three, Spirit, Son and Father have to be of one single hypostasis.

### *Eusebius of Caesarea*

The group who set as their shared mission to remove the 'homoousion' from use have come to be known as the 'Eusebians'. Their acknowledged theological leader was Eusebius of Caesarea, their political head Eusebius of Nicomedia.<sup>110</sup> Sozomenus describes the efforts of the two Eusebius and his colleagues to censure Athanasius of Alexandria.

---

ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι ἔφησεν μονάδι ὁ ἱερός Παῦλος, ἃ μηδὲν τῇ ἐνότητι τῷ θεῷ διαφέρει· ἐνότητι γὰρ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ θεῷ διαφέρει μόνον.'

<sup>108</sup> Marcellus frg. 49 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 44. Frg. 68 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 198. 'εἰ δὲ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὅτι ἐμφυσήσας τοῖς μαθηταῖς «λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον» ἔφησεν, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐξῆλθεν. πῶς οὖν, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα προῆλθεν, πάλιν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται;'

<sup>109</sup> Marcellus frg. 50 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 44. Frg. 69 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 198. 'οὐκ ὁρθῶς οὖν οὐδὲ προσηκόντως εἶρηκεν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις εἶναι φήσας οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον.'

<sup>110</sup> Robertson, *Prolegomena*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:xxxiv.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

The plots of the enemies of Athanasius involved him in fresh troubles, excited by the hatred of the emperor [Constantius] against him, and stirred up a multitude of accusers. Wearied by their importunity, the emperor convened a council at Caesarea in Palestine. Athanasius was summoned thither; but fearing the artifices of Eusebius, bishop of the city, of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and of their party, he refused to attend, and for thirty months, although pressed to attend, persisted in his refusal. At the end of that period, however, he was forced more urgently and repaired to Tyre, where a great number of the bishops of the East were assembled, who commanded him to undergo the charges of those who accused him.<sup>111</sup>

As an ecclesiastical writer, Eusebius of Caesarea receives mixed reviews. Socrates Scholasticus defends him in his *Ecclesiastical History*, saying that ‘The Arians are also certainly deceived in supposing him to be a favorer of their tenets.’<sup>112</sup>

Socrates continues his defence of Eusebius with a series of quotes from Eusebius’ third book *Against Marcellus*, and provides us with insight into Eusebius’ views on the Holy Spirit.

The prophet [Amos 4:12,13 (LXX)] also when he says, “Prepare, Israel, to invoke thy God. For behold he who confirms the thunder, creates the Spirit, and announces his Christ unto men”: ...has not used the work “he who creates” in the sense of makes out of nothing. For God did not then create the Spirit, when he declared his Christ to all men since [Ecclesiastes 1:9] “There is nothing new under the sun”; but the Spirit existed, and had being previously: but he was sent at what time the apostles were gathered together, when like thunder “There came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind; and they were filled with the Holy Spirit.” [Acts 2:2,4].<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl. II*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:275. J. Bidez and G.C. Hansen, *Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte*. Ἀθανασίῳ δὲ πάλιν αἱ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐπιβουλαὶ ἀνεκίνουν πράγματα καὶ μῖσος παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ κατεσκευάζον καὶ κατηγορῶν ἐπήγειρον πλῆθος. παρ’ ὧν ὀχλούμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς σύνοδον γενέσθαι προσέταξεν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης. εἰς ἣν κληθεὶς οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν, Εὐσεβίου τοῦ τῆδε ἐπισκόπου καὶ τοῦ Νικομηδείας καὶ τῶν ἀμφ’ αὐτοὺς δείσας τὴν σκαιωρίαν. ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν καίτοι συνελθεῖν ἀναγκαζόμενος ἀμφὶ τοὺς τριάκοντα μῆνας ἀνεβάλλετο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα σφοδρότερον βιασθεὶς ἤκεν εἰς Τύρον. Ἐνθα δὲ συνελθόντες πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνὰ τὴν ἔω ἐπισκόπων ἐκέλευον αὐτὸν τὰς εὐθύνas ὑπέχειν τῶν κατηγορουμένων.

<sup>112</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:47-48.

<sup>113</sup> Socrates, *Ibid.*; Amos 4:12,13 (LXX); Ecclesiastes 1:9; Acts 2:2,4; Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. εἰπὼν δὲ προφήτης “Ἐτοιμάζου τοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν Θεόν σου, Ἰσραήλ· διότι ἰδοὺ στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτίζων πνεῦμα καὶ ἀναγγέλλων εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ” τὸ

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Eusebius clearly deviates from the more radical position of Asterius in this passage, as he differentiates the notion of ‘creating’. Instead of equating the creation of the Spirit with that of the creation out of nothing, he allows for a pre-existence of the Spirit. But he also contradicts Marcellus that the Spirit did not only come forth as a being during the salvific economy. Instead, he maintains that the Spirit existed prior to him being sent by Christ.

Again he that says, “Create in me a clean heart, O God,” [*Psalms* 51:10] said not this as if he had no heart; but prayed that his mind might be purified. Thus also it is said, [*Ephesians* 2:15] “That he might create the two into one new man,” instead of unite.<sup>114</sup>

As with the heart that has only been cleansed, but existed already, ‘to create’ does not necessarily mean ‘creating from nothing’. The same is shown with the second example where ‘to create’ means ‘to unite’, not to create what did not exist before.

Socrates concludes his defence of Eusebius with these points, highlighting exactly Eusebius’ position which does not assume the beginning of the subsistence to the Son of God and, although he does not the Spirit here, he could have added the pre-existence of the Spirit too:

Such words Eusebius uses in his work against Marcellus; we have quoted them on account of those who have slanderously attempted to traduce and criminate him. Neither can they prove that Eusebius attributes a beginning of subsistence to the Son of God, although they may find him often using the expressions by accommodation; and especially so, because he was an emulator and admirer of the works of Origen, in which those who are able to comprehend the depth of

---

‘κτίζων’ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ γεγονότος ἐξ ἀνυπαρξίας παρείληφεν· Οὐ γὰρ τότε ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, ὅτε τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κατήγγειλεν (‘οὐδὲν γὰρ πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον’), ἀλλ’ ἦν μὲν καὶ προϋπῆρχεν, ἀπεστέλλετο δὲ καθ’ ὃν καιρὸν ἦσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι συνηγμένοι, ὅτε δίκην βροντῆς “Ἐγένετο ἦχος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, ἐπληρώθησαν δὲ πνεύματος ἁγίου”.

<sup>114</sup> Socrates, *Ibid.*; *Psalms* 51:10; *Ephesians* 2:15; Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Καὶ ὁ λέγων δὲ ‘Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοί, ὁ Θεός’, οὐχ ὥς μὴ ἔχων καρδίαν τοῦτ’ ἔλεγεν, καθαρὰν δὲ αὐτῷ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀποτελεσθῆναι ἠϋχετο. Οὕτως εἴρηται καὶ τὸ “Ἴνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον” ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘συναγάγῃ’.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Origen's writings, will perceive it to be everywhere stated that the Son was begotten of the Father.<sup>115</sup>

Yet, in his writing against Marcellus, Eusebius holds close to Asterius with regards to the position of the Spirit when he specifies the relation between Spirit, Son and Father. The Father is seen as the one who generates the Son without further mediation, while the Spirit is brought into existence by the Father mediated through the Son, as *Jn* 1:3 attests:<sup>116</sup>

But the Counselor-Spirit would be neither God nor Son, since he himself has not also received his generation from the Father as the Son has, but is one of those things brought into existence through the Son, because "all things were made through him and without him not one thing was made." [*Jn*. 1:3]<sup>117</sup>

In Eusebius the Father is the Supreme deity, while the Son, whom Eusebius refers to as the 'демиург', is the agent of creation of which the Holy Spirit is the first of the mediated and created beings.<sup>118</sup>

This distinction evident in Eusebius' Trinity, carries forward in his description of the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

For through these [statements] (*Jn*. 16:12-14) the Savior himself clearly taught that the Holy Spirit exists as another besides himself, outstanding in honor and glory and privileges, greater and higher than any [other] intellectual and rational substance (for which reason he

---

<sup>115</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:48-49; Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Τοιαῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Εὐσέβιος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Μάρκελλον διέξεισιν ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτὰ παρεθέμεθα διὰ τοὺς μάτην ἐρεσχελοῦντας καὶ βλασφημεῖν τὸν ἄνδρα ἐπιχειρήσαντας. Οὐτε γὰρ ἔχουσι δεῖξαι ὅτι Εὐσέβιος ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑπάρξεως δίδωσιν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῖς τῆς οἰκονομίας λέξεσιν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις εὐρίσκουσιν αὐτὸν καταχρόμενον), μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι ζηλωτῆς καὶ θαυμαστῆς τῶν Ὠριγένους βιβλίων ἐστίν, ἐν οἷς πανταχοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα εὐρίσκουσιν οἱ τῶν Ὠριγένους βιβλίων τὸ βάθος κατανοῆσαι δυνάμενοι.

<sup>116</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *De ecclesiastica theologia III*, chapter 6.

<sup>117</sup> Eusebius, *Op. cit.*, John 1.3. Klostermann and Hansen, *Op. cit.* English translation by K. M. Spöerl and M. Vinzent, *Eusebius of Caesarea: Against Marcellus I-II, On Church Theology* (2013), 275. τὸ δὲ παράκλητον πνεῦμα οὔτε θεὸς οὔτε υἱός, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν γένεσιν εἴληφεν, ἐν δὲ τι τῶν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ γενομένων τυγχάνει, ὅτι δὴ «πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν».

<sup>118</sup> Eusebius, *Op. cit.*



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

has also been taken up into the holy and thrice-blessed Trinity). Yet he is surely subordinate to [the Son].<sup>119</sup>

Here Eusebius represents the Holy Spirit as a created being with exceptional gifts and of a superior rational substance, which merits the Spirit's having been taken up into the Trinity to occupy a status subordinate to the Son.

Athanasius of Alexandria heads the list of those with a less supportive view of Eusebius. In his *Defence Against the Arians*, Athanasius presents his view.

Their leaders are now, after Eusebius [of Caesarea] and his fellows, Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias in Cilicia, Stephanus of Antioch, George of Laodicea, Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, Menophantus of Ephesus in Asia, Ursacius of Singidunum in Moesia, and Valens of Mursa in Pannonia. These men would not permit those who came with them from the East to meet the holy Council, or even to approach the Church of God; but as they were coming to Sardica, they held Councils in various places by themselves, and made an engagement under threats, that when they came to Sardica, they would not so much as appear at the trial, or attend the assembling...<sup>120</sup>

### *Pseudo-Athanasius*

#### *Contra Arianos IV*

The treatise *Orationes Contra Arianos* contains four discourses. It is generally accepted that Athanasius of Alexandria wrote *Contra Arianos* I through III.

---

<sup>119</sup> Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia III*, chapter 5, Klostermann and Hansen, *Op. cit.* English translation by K. M. Spoerl and M. Vinzent, *CMET* (2013). ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ὑπολαμβάνειν τὸν σωτήρα αὐτὸν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγειν δεινὴ καὶ δυσθεράπευτος εὐήθεια. ἀλλὰ γὰρ σαφῶς διὰ τούτων αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἕτερον ὑπάρχειν παρ' ἑαυτὸν ἐδίδαξεν, τιμῇ μὲν καὶ δόξῃ καὶ πρεσβείοις ὑπερέχον καὶ κρεῖττον καὶ ἀνώτερον πάσης τῆς νοερᾶς καὶ λογικῆς τυγχάνον οὐσίας (διὸ καὶ συμπαρεῖληπται τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ τρισμακαρίᾳ τριάδι), ὑποβεβηκός γε μὴν [εἶναι] αὐτοῦ.

<sup>120</sup> Athanasius, *Defence Against the Arians*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:125-126. H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1, 1940: 87-168. Εἰσὶ δὲ τούτων μετὰ τοὺς περὶ Εὐσέβιον νῦν ἑξαρχοὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ ἀπὸ Ἡρακλείας, Νάρκισσος ὁ ἀπὸ Νερωνιάδος τῆς Κιλικίας, Στέφανος ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας, Γεώργιος ὁ ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, Ἀκάκιος ὁ ἀπὸ Καισαρείας τῆς Παλαιστίνης, Μηνόφαντος ἀπὸ Ἐφέσου τῆς Ἀσίας, Οὐρσάκιος ὁ ἀπὸ Σιγγιδόνου τῆς Μυσίας, Οὐάλης ἀπὸ Μουρσῶν τῆς Παννονίας. καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐλθόντας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφῶς οὐκ ἐπέτρεπον οὔτε εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον εἰσελθεῖν οὔτε ὅλως εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ παραβάλλειν. καὶ ἐρχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν Σερδικὴν κατὰ τόπους συνόδους ἐποιοῦντο καθ' ἑαυτοὺς καὶ συνθήκας μετὰ ἀπειλῶν, ὥστε ἐλθόντας αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Σερδικὴν μὴδὲ ὅλως εἰς τὴν κρίσιν ἐλθεῖν μὴδ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνελθεῖν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐλθόντας καὶ ἀφοσιώσει τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδειξαμένους ταχέως φυγεῖν.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*Contra Arianos IV*, however, is different enough in style and content from the first three that it has led scholars to doubt it was written by Athanasius and to attribute it instead to an unknown author identified as Pseudo-Athanasius.<sup>121</sup> It has been suggested that this work was the first known tract written by Apollinarius of Laodicea.<sup>122</sup> In *C. Arianos IV*, some of the earliest descriptive statements on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit commence with *chapter 13*, where Pseudo-Athanasius argues the absurdity of the presuppositions upon which both Sabellianism and Arianism rest and the implications of those with regard to the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

This perhaps he [Marcellus] borrowed from the Stoics, who maintain that their God contracts and again expands with the creation, and then rests without end. For what is dilated is first straitened; and what is expanded is at first contracted; and it is what it was, and does but undergo an affection. If then the Monad being dilated became a Triad, and the Monad was the Father, and the Triad is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, first the Monad being dilated, underwent an affection and became what it was not; for it was dilated, whereas it had not been dilated. Next, if the Monad itself was dilated into a Triad, and that, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, then Father and Son and Spirit prove the same, as Sabellius held, unless the Monad which he speaks of is something besides the Father, and then he ought not to speak of dilation, since the Monad was to make Three, so that there was a Monad, and then Father, Son, and Spirit. For if the Monad were dilated, and expanded itself, it must itself be that which was expanded.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> Robertson, *Excursus C*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:431-432. In his re-work of John Cardinal Newman's original introduction to *C. Arianos IV*, Archibald Robertson preserves Newman's observations that this discourse lacks the continuity of argument and does not follow the plan of the first three discourses. Further to Newman's points, the fourth discourse seems to refer to Eusebius of Caesarea as alive at the time of writing.

<sup>122</sup> See the cautious arguments in M. Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium* (Leiden a.o., 1996), and already A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer' als "κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος" ein Apollinarisgut* (Würzburg, 1917),

<sup>123</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:437-438. *PG* 26:484C-485A. A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer' als "κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος" ein Apollinarisgut*, 1917, 43-87. Τοῦτο δὲ ἴσως ἀπὸ τῶν Στωϊκῶν ὑπέλαβε διαβεβαιουμένων συστέλλεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἐκτείνεσθαι τὸν θεὸν μετὰ τῆς κτίσεως καὶ ἀπείρως παύεσθαι. Τὸ γὰρ πλατυνόμενον ἀπὸ στενότητος πλατύνεται, καὶ τὸ ἐκτεινόμενον συνεσταλμένον ἐκτείνεται· καὶ αὐτὸ μὲν ἔστιν, πλέον δὲ οὐδὲν ἢ πάθος ὑπομένει. Εἰ τοίνυν ἡ μονὰς πλατυνθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς, ἡ δὲ μονὰς ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ, τριάς δὲ πατήρ, υἱός, ἅγιον πνεῦμα, πρῶτον μὲν πλατυνθεῖσα ἡ μονὰς

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

So, following the presuppositions of this view to their logical conclusions, Pseudo-Athanasius demonstrates that such a physical model for God's agency in creation leads to a necessary disjunction where neither the Monad nor the Triad can maintain unity of nature. Since such models necessitate a change in the nature of God, they are, by definition, in error. This finding illustrates how both the Sabellian and Arian models fail when they posit their versions of a Monad and Triad acting in creation.<sup>124</sup> By extension, Pseudo-Athanasius preserves the unity of nature of the Trinity and asserts the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Proceeding in his refutation to display the logical consequences of Sabellianism and Arianism, Pseudo-Athanasius in *chapter 25* shows how these versions of God's action affect baptism and the role of the Holy Spirit.<sup>125</sup> When the Arians – as can be seen from Asterius' position, but we could equally add Arius – argue 'that the Son is from nothing, and that once He was not,' and the Sabellians argue (from 1 *Corinthians* 12:4) that the Persons of God are mere names then the grace delivered by the Holy Spirit will be lost along with Creation.

For he says, 'As there are "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit," so also the Father is the same, but is dilated into Son and Spirit.' Now this is full of absurdity; for if as with the Spirit, so it is with God, the Father will be Word and Holy Spirit, to one becoming Father, to another Son, to another Spirit, accommodating himself to the need of each... And the name of the Son and the Spirit will necessarily cease, when the need has been supplied; and what happens will altogether be but make-belief, because it has been displayed, not in truth but in name. ...then the grace of Baptism will cease too... Nay, what will follow but the annihilation of the creation?<sup>126</sup>

---

πάθος ὑπέμεινε καὶ γέγονεν, ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν (ἐπλατύνθη γὰρ οὐκ οὐσα πλατεῖα), ἔπειτα εἰ αὐτὴ ἡ μονὰς ἐπλατύνθη εἰς τριάδα, τριάς δέ ἐστι πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὁ αὐτὸς ἄρα πατὴρ γέγονε καὶ υἱὸς καὶ πνεῦμα κατὰ Σαβέλλιον, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ λεγομένη παρ' αὐτῷ μονὰς ἄλλο τί ἐστι παρὰ τὸν πατέρα. Οὐκ ἔτι οὖν πλατύνεσθαι ἔδει λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἡ μονὰς τριῶν ποιητικὴ, ὥστε εἶναι μονάδα, εἶτα καὶ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπλατύνθη αὕτη καὶ ἐξέτεινεν ἑαυτήν, αὐτὴ ἂν εἴη, ὅπερ ἐξετάθη. Καί τριάς μὲν πλατυνθεῖσα οὐκ ἔτι μονὰς ἐστίν· μονὰς δὲ οὐσα οὕτω ἦν τριάς.

<sup>124</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos* IV, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:438-439. *PG* 26484C-485A. Stegmann, *Op. cit.*

<sup>125</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos* IV, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:443. *PG* 505C-508A. Stegmann, *Op. cit.*

<sup>126</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos* IV, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:443. *PG* 26:505C-508A. Stegmann, *Op. cit.* Μαίνεται μὲν οὖν Ἀρειὸς ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἶναι λέγων τὸν υἱόν, καὶ ,ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν'. Μαίνεται δὲ καὶ Σαβέλλιος λέγων τὸν πατέρα εἶναι υἱόν, καὶ ἔμπαλιν τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι πατέρα, ὑποστάσει μὲν ἓν, ὀνόματι δὲ δύο. Μαίνεται δὲ καὶ παραδείγματι χρώμενος τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτι. Φησὶ γάρ·

Further to the nature of the Holy Spirit, Pseudo-Athanasius in *chapter 29* likens the being of the Holy Spirit to that of the Son.<sup>127</sup>

...let them who are thus disputatious, say where in the Old [First Testament] is mention made of the Spirit, [as] the Paraclete? For of the Holy Spirit there is mention, but nowhere of the Paraclete. Is then the Holy Spirit one, and the Paraclete another, and the Paraclete the later, as not mentioned in the Old [First Testament]? But far be it to say that the Spirit is later, or to distinguish the Holy Spirit as one and the Paraclete as another; for the Spirit is one and the same, then and now hallowing and comforting those who are His recipients... But neither is the Paraclete second, for He was before all, ...and as the Saviour says concerning the Spirit, 'But the Paraclete which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My Name [*John 14:26*],' speaking of One and Same, and not distinguishing, ...For here too he [*John*] does not distinguish but witnesses to the identity. ...He then who dares distinguish between Word and Son, let him distinguish between Spirit and Paraclete; but if the Spirit cannot be distinguished, so neither can the Word, being also Son and Wisdom and Power.<sup>128</sup>

---

«ὥσπερ διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα», οὕτως καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὁ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐστίν, πλατύνεται δὲ εἰς υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα. Ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο μεστὸν ἀτοπίας. Εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, ἔσται ὁ πατήρ λόγος καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὃ μὲν γινόμενος πατήρ, ὃ δὲ λόγος, ὃ δὲ πνεῦμα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν ἐκάστου ἀρμοζόμενος, καὶ ὀνόματι μὲν υἱὸς καὶ πνεῦμα, τῷ δὲ ὄντι πατήρ μόνον, ἀρχὴν μὲν ἔχων τὸ γίνεσθαι υἱός, πανόμενος δὲ τοῦ λέγεσθαι πατήρ, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας μὲν ὀνόματι, τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ μηδὲ ἐπιδημήσας, καὶ ψευδόμενος μὲν τῷ λέγειν «ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ», τῷ δὲ ὄντι αὐτὸς ὢν πατήρ; καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἄτοπα ἐπὶ Σαβελλίου ἀπαντᾷ. Ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ παυθῆσεσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς χρείας πληρωθείσης· καὶ ἔσται λοιπὸν ἄχρι παιδιᾶς τὰ γινόμενα, ὅτι μὴ ἀληθεία, ἀλλ' ὀνόματι ἐπεδείχθη. Πανομένου δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ κατ' αὐτοὺς παύσεται καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἡ χάρις· εἰς γὰρ υἱὸν ἐδόθη. Καὶ τί ἀκολουθήσει ἢ ἀφανισμὸς τῆς κτίσεως; Εἰ γάρ, ἵνα ἡμεῖς κτισθῶμεν, προῆλθεν ὁ λόγος, καὶ προελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν, δῆλον, ὅτι ἀναχωροῦντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν πατέρα, ὡς φασιν, οὐκ ἔτι ἐσόμεθα. Οὕτως γὰρ ἔσται, ὥσπερ ἦν· οὕτως οὐκ ἔτ' ἐσόμεθα, ὥσπερ οὖν οὐκ ἦμεν. Οὐκ ἔτι γὰρ προελθόντος οὐκ ἔτι ἢ κτίσις ἔσται.

<sup>127</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:445. *PG* 26:512C-513C.

<sup>128</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:445. *PG* 26:512C-513C. Stegmann, *Op. cit.* Ἔστιν ἄρα καὶ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ φανερώς περὶ υἱοῦ κείμενα, εἰ καὶ περιττόν ἐστι περὶ τούτων ἀμφισβητεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ νεώτερά ἐστιν, λεγέτωσαν οἱ οὕτως φιλονεικοῦντες, ποῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς περὶ τοῦ Παρακλήτου πνεύματος εἴρηται; Περὶ πνεύματος μὲν γὰρ ἁγίου ἐλέχθη, περὶ Παρακλήτου δὲ οὐδαμῶς. Ἄρ' οὖν ἕτερόν ἐστι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ἕτερος ὁ Παράκλητος, καὶ νεώτερος ὁ Παράκλητος, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ κεῖται; Ἀλλὰ μὴ γένοιτο ἢ νεώτερον εἰπεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, ἢ διελεῖν καὶ ἕτερον εἰπεῖν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἕτερον τὸν Παράκλητον. Ἐν γὰρ καὶ ταυτὸν ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἁγιάζον καὶ παρακαλοῦν τοὺς δεκτικούς αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἷς καὶ αὐτὸς λόγος υἱὸς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν ἄγων καὶ τότε τοὺς ἀξίους. Ἦσαν γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ υἱοί, οὐ δι' ἄλλου, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τεκνοποιούμενοι. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν καὶ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας υἱὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, πῶς πρὸ πάντων ἐστὶν ὄντων πρὸ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν; Πῶς δὲ καὶ πρωτότοκος, δεῦτερος μετὰ πολλοὺς εὐρισκόμενος; Ἀλλ' οὔτε δεῦτερος ὁ

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In showing that the Holy Spirit and Paraclete are one and the same from antiquity [First Testament] to the present age [Second Testament], and not to be differentiated in nature or time, Pseudo-Athanasius wrests from both the Sabellians and Arians a proof text for subordination of the Holy Spirit by nature or Paraclete by an apparent emergence in time. Asterius, Eusebius, and Acacius, but also Marcellus of Ancyra provoked this response,<sup>129</sup> an argument for the divine nature and role of the Holy Spirit in ‘hallowing and comforting’ the faithful, by their assertions concerning the Spirit and Paraclete.

The work of the Holy Spirit continues with *chapter 32*.

More clearly however and indisputably than all reasoning does what was said by the Archangel to the Bearer of God herself, shew the oneness of the Divine Word and Man. For he says, ‘The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also the Holy Child which shall be born of thee, shall be called Son of God [*Luke 1:35*].’<sup>130</sup>

Asterius had read *Luke 1:35* as if the Spirit was nothing but a shadow of the highest Power and, therefore, could not be equated with the divine light of the Father. What in Asterius’ eyes was a ‘protective scheme of creation and salvation that shields the creatures from an overpowering and potentially deadly pure hand

---

Παράκλητος (πρὸ πάντων γὰρ ἦν) οὔτε νεώτερος ὁ υἱός («ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ λόγος») καὶ ὡς ταὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ Παράκλητος, οὕτως ταὐτὸν ὁ υἱὸς καὶ λόγος· καὶ ὡς φησιν ὁ σωτὴρ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος· «ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου», ταὐτὸν λέγων καὶ οὐ διαρῶν, οὕτως ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸ ὁμοιον διηγούμενος λέγει· «καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός». Καὶ ἐνταῦθα γὰρ οὐ διεῖλεν, ἀλλὰ

τὴν ταυτότητα ἀπήγγειλεν. Καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἄλλος Παράκλητος, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἀλλ’ ἐν καὶ ταὐτόν, οὕτως οὐκ ἄλλος λόγος, καὶ ἄλλος υἱός, ἀλλ’ ὁ λόγος μονογενὴς ἐστίν. Δόξαν γὰρ οὐκ αὐτῆς εἶπε τῆς σαρκός, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου. Ὁ τοίνυν τολμῶν διαρεῖν λόγον καὶ υἱὸν διαρεῖτω καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ Παράκλητον. Εἰ δὲ ἀδιαίρετον τὸ πνεῦμα, ἀδιαίρετος καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν υἱὸς καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις.

<sup>129</sup> Markus Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium* (1996) 125-128, 380-385. See also Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J., *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (1999) 121-123, 182-209. See too Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (1867).

<sup>130</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:445-446. *PG* 26:517B. Stegmann, *Op. cit.* Σαφέστερον δὲ καὶ ἀναμφισβήτητον παντὸς λογισμοῦ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν θεοτόκον πρὸς τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου ῥηθὲν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ θείου λόγου καὶ ἀνθρώπου δείξειεν. Φησὶ γάρ· «πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ». *Luke 1:35*.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

of God' had consequences with regards to the Spirit and the Son.<sup>131</sup> 'According to Asterius, the Son was light and shone above all things in the noetic world, himself being one of the noetic beings (like the sun that is shining on everything by being one of those created elements that receive its sunshine).<sup>132</sup> Thus the Son made the divine light of the Father bearable to the creation, as "the God of the universe, when he decided to make the created nature, recognized that it could not stand the non-weakened hand of God."<sup>133</sup> As the Son was both less divine than the Father and at the same time protected creation from the overpowering pure nature of God, so did the Spirit further reduced the otherwise threatening divine power/or: further reduced the threat divine power presented to creation. Mary was not touched by the direct, full divine light of the Father, but the Son was engendered in her by the shadow of the Spirit whose divinity was proportionate to her. On this understanding of the incarnation, one can see the need for Asterius' clear distinction between the *hypostases* of the Father, Son, and Spirit. Contrary to Asterius, however, Marcellus insisted that the Spirit has never been a cause for shadow or darkness and that the Savior himself in *Jn* 4:24 spoke of the Spirit as "God" and "light,"<sup>134</sup> both of which claims counter Asterius' reductionist view. Marcellus may have had in view the "Power of the Most High", mentioned in *Luke* 1:35, even if it is not present in his quoted text as we have it. Eusebius, who provides us with this debate about the Spirit, sides with Asterius and rejects Marcellus' criticism of Asterius. To Eusebius, the Spirit's procession from the Father clearly shows both the hierarchical process of the one who sends and the other through whom somebody is sent and the third who is sent and their hypostatical difference.<sup>135</sup> In the case of the Spirit, sending is going forth and being distinct from the sender, not only from the moment of being sent. Of the Spirit one has to think, what is said by Daniel of the "thousand of thousands",<sup>136</sup> when they stood 'by the throne of God' but were neither God nor throne, but distinct from God and throne while being close to them. 'Being

---

<sup>131</sup> M. Vinzent and K. M. Spoerl, 'Introduction' in their forthcoming translation of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Against Marcellus and On Church Theology*.

<sup>132</sup> See Asterius, frag. 23 (94 V.).

<sup>133</sup> Asterius, frag. 26 (94 V.).

<sup>134</sup> See Marcellus, frag. 64 (57 K./H.) (54,10-12 V.).

<sup>135</sup> See Eusebius, ET III.4.7-9 (159,14-33 K./H.).

<sup>136</sup> *Dn.* 7:10.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

with' and 'going forth', therefore, have to be taken as indications of a separation of hypostases, not as expressions of a mia-hypostatic unity.'<sup>137</sup>

In *chapter 35*, Pseudo-Athanasius puts forward the anointing of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit.

But if the Scripture often calls even the body by the name of Christ, as in the blessed Peter's words to Cornelius, when he teaches him of 'Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit [*Acts 10:38*]' ...<sup>138</sup>

This anointing with the Holy Spirit, he argues, is proof of Jesus' Godhead, moreover, as this and the previous passage show, for Pseudo-Athanasius, the Spirit is the Power of the Highest and has to be seen as belonging to the homoousian Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

### *Contra Sabellianos*

Amongst the collection of works originally attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria is an homily entitled *Contra Sabellianos*. Recent scholarship has determined that *Contra Sabellianos* was written by another unknown author, hence the attribution to Pseudo-Athanasius. In the notes in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* 28, the affinity of this document with Basil of Casarea's *Homilia XXIV Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* is recognised.<sup>139</sup> The similarities in

---

<sup>137</sup> M. Vinzent and K. M. Spoerl, 'Introduction' in their forthcoming translation of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Against Marcellus and On Church Theology*.

<sup>138</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *C. Arianos IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:446. *PG* 26:521A. Stegmann, *Op. cit.* Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καλεῖ πολυαχοῦ ἡ γραφὴ «Χριστόν», ὥς ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος πρὸς Κορνήλιον διδάσκων «Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ». *Acts* 10:38.

<sup>139</sup> Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J., "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison", (1986), 365-389; Lienhard finds, 'At more than a dozen places the two homilies agree verbatim, or almost so, making it clear that the author of one homily had the text of the other before him as he wrote, and copied from it... Montfaucon, the Maurist editor of Athanasius's works, recognized this relationship. In his *monitum* to the *Contra Sabellianos*, he compared the *C. Sab.* with Basil's homily and concluded that the *C. Sab.* was spurious and dependent upon Basil's homily...

In 1956 Hermann Dörries analysed Basil's homily for its doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Dörries shows a close relationship between the homily and chapter 18 of Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto*, and concludes that either Basil preached the homily as he was writing chapter 18, or he used his own homily, preached earlier, as a source for chapter 18. The homily, Dörries writes, cannot be much later than *De Spiritu Sancto*, because the controversy with the Pneumatomachi is presented as a topic that the community is eager to hear about...

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

content on the Holy Spirit between Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* and Basil's *Homilia XXIV* receive more attention later in this chapter. A comparison of two works attributed to Pseudo- Athanasius, *Contra Arianos IV* and *Contra Sabellianos*, must come first for a view of their development of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

As introduced above in this survey, Reinhard M. Hübner analysed the *Contra Sabellianos* of Pseudo-Athanasius. Hübner names Apolinarius of Laodicea as the author of this treatise against Photinus of Sirmium (a writer in the tradition of Marcellus of Ancyra). Further analysis has lead Hübner to suggest that *Contra Sabellianos* was written possibly in the years 355-360, and no later than 371. Hübner argues that the *Contra Sabellianos* widely influenced other authors.<sup>140</sup>

The identity of the author is by no means proven. Yet, as Hübner insightfully recognised, *Contra Sabellianos* is a promising source in the search for theological ideas that bear upon the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit.<sup>141</sup>

Since the first two parts of *Contra Sabellianos* focus on the relation of the Father and the Son, it is more to purpose to survey the third part of the treatise, which contains theological content on the Holy Spirit. A search of this last part of *Contra Sabellianos* yields significant theological content on the Holy Spirit.<sup>142</sup>

Pseudo-Athanasius offers the following descriptions of the Holy Spirit which are noticeably similar to what we found in *Contra Arianos IV* (which is, of course, no surprise, if the two texts were written by the same author).

1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>143</sup>

---

Paul Fedwick also accepts Basil's homily as authentic, and in his book [cited in this survey] on Basil takes over Bernardi's date of 378.'

<sup>140</sup> Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 367. Cf. Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 47-125.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 108-125.

<sup>142</sup> Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 369.

<sup>143</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:100D-101A. Ὅταν οὖν περὶ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ, «Ἐγώ,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς, «Ἐκεῖνος,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, «ἄλλος,» πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία,



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

2) The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>144</sup>

3) That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>145</sup>

4) God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the activity is differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o*.<sup>146</sup> Despite this differentiated activity the Father's hypostasis is the only one, of which the Son is the character and in whom the Father's hypostasis shines forth. Although (as in *C. Ar. IV*) the teaching on the Spirit is not as developed as that on Father and Son, it becomes clear that the Spirit is foremost the Spirit of the Son. The Spirit is life of the Son who, in turn, is the origin of life, as the Father is the source of everything. This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:112D.; Ἄνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἀνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννῶν ὑποπεύσης. PG 28:113A; δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τρόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο. PG 28:113C; Δῶμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς βραχείας τινὰς εἰκόνας ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀσωμάτων, τινῶν ἐπιμνησθέντες πραγμάτων, ἃ δὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως φαίνεται, εἴ πως δυνηθεῖεν διὰ τούτων ἀναβαίνοντες ἐννοῆσαί πως τὸ ἀσώματον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι τόπους αὐτῶν, μηδὲ τοπικὰς διαιρέσεις τῆς Τριάδος ἐπινοεῖν.

<sup>145</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116A; Ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέχεται πλείονων τρόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τρόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τόποις διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱὸν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτῳ· ὅτι μηδὲ ἔστι τρόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστῳ. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 384.

<sup>146</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:113A; Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. PG 28: 117A; Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. PG 28:117B; Ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τοῦτο συμπλέξας τὸ ἐξ οὗ, καὶ δι' οὗ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ, βιάζομαι τὴν Τριάδα μονάδα ποιεῖν. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 384.

<sup>147</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116C; ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμπαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

5) While retaining the use of prepositions to differentiate the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Pseudo-Athanasius asserts that in the Trinity perceptible to humankind God's activity (*energeia*) is one (117A), and, likewise, that God's form (*eidos*) is one.<sup>148</sup>

At this point it is useful to compare the descriptions of the Holy Spirit that appear in *Contra Arianos IV* with those in *Contra Sabellianos*. On the nature of the Holy Spirit, *Contra Arianos IV* argues that the Holy Spirit shares unity of substance with the Father and Son. By contrast, *Contra Sabellianos* describes the Holy Spirit as a Person (*prosopon*) of the Trinity; also, there is use of the term *hypostases* to mean 'persons' rather than 'substances'.

On the divinity of the Holy Spirit, *Contra Arianos IV* cites God's anointing of Jesus Christ (on Acts 10:38) as evidence of the Holy Spirit's divinity. Parallel to this, *Contra Sabellianos* holds up that it is one divine activity which is exerted by all three, it is one divine *eidos*, or perfect form, of God which is expressed in baptism. On the role of the Holy Spirit, *Contra Arianos IV* and *Contra Sabellianos* present the Paraclete, who comforts and sanctifies believers; as well, both treatises recall the Holy Spirit's role in the Incarnation.

### *Apolinarius of Laodicea*

Socrates Scholasticus reports that (ca 360), there arose a debate in the churches about whether the Holy Spirit is or is not to be considered consubstantial with the Father and the Son. He introduces Apolinarius as a church man who fell out of favour with Bishop George of Laodicea, presumably because he 'dissented from George' due to his perception that George 'sometimes maintained that the Son is like the Father, in accordance with what had been determined in the Synod of

---

<sup>148</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:117A. συντιθείς. Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρᾷ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. Cit.*, 385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Seleucia, and at other times countenanced the Arian view.’<sup>149</sup> Socrates further reports that ‘Apollinaris, who was well trained in eloquence, expounded the gospels and apostolic doctrines in the way of dialogue, as Plato among the Greeks had done.’<sup>150</sup>

Apollinarius is recognized as having ‘reached the doctrine of the Trinity’ before Basil of Caesarea and the other Cappadocian theologians.<sup>151</sup> Harnack reports that:

As is proved by his correspondence with Basil and as his own writings shew, Apollinaris was the first who completely *developed* the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. He was, however, more strongly influenced by Aristotle than the Cappadocians were, and accordingly in his case the conception of the *one* divine substance was a shade nearer the idea of a mere generic conception than with them, although he too was in no way satisfied with the genuine conception. Apollinaris further retained the old image of *auge*, *aktis*, *elios*, not, however, as it would appear, in order by it to illustrate the unity, but rather the greatness of the persons (*Peri trias* 12, 17).<sup>152</sup>

This study devotes more discussion to Apollinarius in subsequent chapters.

### ***Athanasius of Alexandria***

Athanasius received a gracious letter of recall to his episcopal see at Alexandria (362) from the Emperor Jovian. In his letter of reply, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, Athanasius had this to say about the Holy Spirit:

But since now certain who wish to renew the Arian heresy have presumed to set at nought this faith confessed at Nicaea by the Fathers, and while pretending to confess it, do in fact deny it, explaining away the ‘Coessential,’ and blaspheming of their own accord against the Holy Spirit, in affirming that It is a creature, and came into being as a thing made by the Son, we hasten as of bounden duty, in view of the injury resulting to the people from such blasphemy, to hand to your Piety the faith confessed at Nicaea; in

---

<sup>149</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:74-75.

<sup>150</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. III*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:86-87.

<sup>151</sup> Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ed. T. K. Cheyne, 4:119.

<sup>152</sup> Harnack, *Op. cit.*, 4:119.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

order that thy religiousness may know what has been written with all accuracy, and how far wrong they are who teach contrary to it.<sup>153</sup>

Athanasius' struggle against his 'Arian' opponents spans five decades from the Council of Nicaea to his death in 373 CE. In his writing, and of particular interest in this study, Athanasius addressed the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in these works: *Contra Arianos I*, *Epistulae ad Serapionem*, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, and *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*. Socrates Scholasticus describes the end of Athanasius' life.

It must be said that as long as Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, was alive, the emperor [Valens] restrained by the Providence of God, abstained from molesting Alexandria and Egypt: indeed he knew very well that the multitude of those who were attached to Athanasius was very great; and on that account he was careful lest the public affairs should be hazarded, by the Alexandrians, who are an irritable race, being excited to sedition. But Athanasius, after being engaged in so many and such severe conflicts on behalf of the church amidst the greatest perils forty-six years. He left as his successor Peter, a devout and eloquent man.<sup>154</sup>

This study devotes more discussion to Athanasius in subsequent chapters.

### *Acacius of Caesarea*

Upon the death of Eusebius Pamphilus (in 340 CE) in Caesarea (in the Levant), Acacius became bishop. He wrote many works, amongst them a biography of his mentor and predecessor.<sup>155</sup>

A composite sketch of Acacius is provided by Richard P. Hanson:<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Athanasius, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:567-568. There is a probable reference to this letter in *Epistula* 364 written by Apolinarius of Laodicea to Basil of Caesarea.

<sup>154</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:105. Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Περὶ μὲν δὴ τούτου τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι, ἕως περιῆν Ἀθανάσιος ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπίσκοπος, ἕκ τινος Θεοῦ προνοίας ὑπερέθετο ταράξαι τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, πυνθανόμενος πλεῖστον εἶναι κατ' αὐτὴν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν προσκειμένων Ἀθανασίῳ καὶ ἐκ τούτου ὑφορώμενος, μήποτε γενομένης κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν στάσεως φύσει τὸ δημῶδες ἔνθερμον ὃν προσβλάψῃ τὰ δημόσια πράγματα. Ὁ δὲ Ἀθανάσιος ἐν ὑπατείᾳ Γρατιανοῦ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ Πρόβου μετὰ πολλοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀγῶνας τὸν τῇδε βίον κατέλειπεν, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτη σὺν πολλοῖς κινδύνοις τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν διανύσας, καταλιπὼν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον Πέτρον, ἄνδρα εὐλαβῆ καὶ ἐλλόγιμον.

<sup>155</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:37.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

...Earlier in the same work [Epiphanius' *Panarion*], however, he has quoted several extracts from a work which Akakius [Acacius of Caesarea] wrote early in his career against Marcellus, who in his turn, is quoting and attacking a work by Asterius. It is difficult in places to determine who precisely is being quoted. But clearly Akakius at this stage defended with some spirit Asterius' statement that the Son was 'the exact image of the *ousia* and will and power and glory of the Father'. He is ready to go to any lengths, following Asterius, in extolling the Son, as long as the traditional subordination of the Son to the Father is preserved. He can call the Son 'living image of the *ousia* of the Father', and, though possessing his own *ousia* (distinct from that of the Father) he is '*ousia* as image of the *ousia*' of the Father, in respect of will, life and power.

Acacius further describes the image of the Son:

"the image 'bears the characteristics of the original in itself and also provides a difference, a difference as a likeness... Therefore the Son is an image of the Father, living (image) of the Living One in a movement, in activity, in power and will and glory, not devoid of life (*apsykos*) nor of movement (*akinetos*), deriving its existence and delineation from another, and itself not being in motion in itself or through itself. And he is the exact image so that the exact resemblance does not present a Father but, but precisely a Son' (*Yion apekribomenon*)."<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, 582.

<sup>157</sup> Hanson, *Op. cit.*, 582-583. Drawn from Epiphanius' *Panarion*; also, see Athanasius' *De Synodis* 38:1-4. ὦ Ἀκάκιε καὶ Εὐδόξιε, οὐ φεύγετε τὴν ἐκτεθεῖσαν ἐν τοῖς Ἐγκαινίοις πίστιν, ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ γέγραπται· 'οὐσίας ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός', πῶς ἐν τῇ Ἰσαυρίᾳ γράφετε· 'ἐκβάλλομεν τὸ ὁμοούσιον'; εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι κατ' οὐσίαν ὁμοῖος ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί, πῶς 'ἀπαράλλακτος τῆς οὐσίας εἰκὼν' ἐστίν; εἰ δὲ μετέγνωτε γράψαντες τὸ 'τῆς οὐσίας ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν', πῶς ἀναθεματίζετε τοὺς 'ἀνόμοιον' εἶναι λέγοντας τὸν υἱόν; εἰ γὰρ οὐχ 'ὁμοῖος κατ' οὐσίαν' πάντως 'ἀνόμοιός' ἐστι. τὸ δὲ ἀνόμοιον οὐκ ἂν εἴη 'εἰκὼν'. εἰ δὲ οὕτω καθ' ὑμᾶς ἐστίν, οὐκ ἄρα «ὁ τὸν υἱὸν ἐωρακὼς ἐώρακε τὸν πατέρα» πλείστης ὁσῆς οὐσῆς διαφορᾶς, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ ὅλον ὄντος τούτου πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀνομοίου. τὸ δὲ ἀνόμοιον οὐχ οἷόν τε ὁμοιον λέγεσθαι. ποῖα τοίνυν μηχανῇ τὸ ἀνόμοιον ὁμοιον λέγετε καὶ τὸ ὁμοιον ἀνόμοιον φρονεῖτε καὶ ὑποκρίνεσθε λέγοντες 'εἰκόνα εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν'; εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι κατ' οὐσίαν ὁμοῖος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, λείπει τι τῇ εἰκόνι καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πλήρης εἰκὼν οὐδὲ τέλειον ἀπαύγασμα. πῶς οὖν ἀναγινώσκετε τὸ «ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς» καὶ «ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν»; πῶς τὸν Ἀρειανὸν Ἀέτιον ὡς αἰρετικὸν ἐκβάλλετε, καίτοι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκεῖνῳ λέγοντες; καὶ γὰρ σοὺ μὲν, ὦ Ἀκάκιε, ἐταῖρός ἐστιν, Εὐδοξίου δὲ διδάσκαλος εἰς τὴν τοιαύτην ἀσέβειαν γέγονεν, ἥς ἕνεκα καὶ Λεόντιος αὐτὸν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος διάκονον κατέστησεν, ἵνα ὡς ἐν ἐνδύματι προβάτου τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς διακονίας χρώμενος ἐπ' ἀδείας ἐξεμεῖν δύνῃται τὰ τῆς βλασφημίας ῥήματα.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Acacius follows in the footsteps of his mentor Eusebius of Caesarea, and, as such, locates himself doctrinally amongst those who can accept *ousia* to describe the shared nature of the Son with the Father, as long as the Son is subordinated to the Father.<sup>158</sup>

At the Synod of Seleucia, Acacius and his party proposed a creedal statement. Amongst its points about the relation of the Son to the Father – especially the troubling effect of any references to *ousia*, as well as the discomfort with *anomoion* [unlike in substance], and the absence of support for either in Scripture – is the assertion of “the *homoion* [likeness] of the Son to the Father”.<sup>159</sup> Thus, in the view of Acacius and his supporters, the *homoion* relation of the Son to the Father seems the preferred middle course.<sup>160</sup>

The Acacian confession then moves on to make these assertions about the Holy Spirit:

...We believe also in the Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Saviour has denominated the Comforter, and whom he sent to his disciples after his departure, according to his promise: by whom also he sanctifies all believers in the church, who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>161</sup>

This description of the Holy Spirit is more carefully worded than other statements from Acacius and his partisans, in the hope that it would be accepted by the Synod. It bears none of the phrasings that describe the Holy Spirit in semi-Arian terms as a being created by the *Logos*, accorded a status subordinate to the Son, endowed with superior rational substance and taken up into the Trinity. Yet, with *ousia* dismissed from the earlier part of the creedal statement, neither is there anything in this description of the Holy Spirit to discourage Arians or encourage their opponents.

---

<sup>158</sup> Hanson, *The Search*, 583.

<sup>159</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:69.

<sup>160</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:84.

<sup>161</sup> Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:69; Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*, Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὃ καὶ παράκλητον ὠνόμασεν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐπαγγελάμενος μετὰ τὸ ἀπελθεῖν αὐτὸν πέμψαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῦτο, ὃ καὶ ἀπέστειλεν, δι' οὗ καὶ ἀγιάζει τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πιστεύοντας καὶ βαπτιζομένους ἐν ὀνόματι πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

***Basil of Caesarea***

Basil condemned the ‘foolish wisdom’ of Hellenistic philosophy where it failed to give precepts shared by Christian theology. God’s order was to be valued and that Hellenistic chance was to be rejected came to a dramatic demonstration in Caesarea (Asia Minor) during the reign of the pagan emperor Julian. Christians destroyed the only pagan temple there, the one dedicated to the Hellenistic goddess Tyche (a deity conflated with the Roman goddess Fortuna).<sup>162</sup>

Basil successfully repelled attempts from the pagan Emperor Julian (his old school mate at university in Athens) to wrest Hellenistic philosophy and rhetoric away from Christian scholars, specifically, by the emperor’s edict excluding them from teaching at university, and Basil accomplished this feat with letters written from the comfortable distance of Cappadocia.<sup>163</sup> Upon Julian’s departure, a brief respite for the Nicene party ended with the accession of the Arian Emperor Valens. When the Arian persecutions mounted, bolstered by the new emperor’s active support, Basil stepped in to defend the Church.<sup>164</sup>

Basil entered into the struggle against ‘Arianism’ in about the year 364, and this provided the arena in which he was able to develop and refine definitions of Christian doctrine. ‘Arianism’s’ chief proponent, Eunomius, followed the Platonic principle put forward by his mentor Aetius that God as the first-cause was pure divinity, but that the Son and Holy Spirit possessed lesser divinity by degrees of derivation in time and order. Further, Eunomius asserted that God’s nature could be described as one without begetting (*agennesia*), thereby ignoring a constraint of earlier Arianism that it was not possible for humans to know the nature of God.<sup>165</sup>

Basil, in his three books *Against Eunomius*, argued the following critical points:

---

<sup>162</sup> Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: the Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*, 160.

<sup>163</sup> Anthony Meredith SJ, *The Cappadocians*, 124-125.

<sup>164</sup> Meredith, *Op. cit.*, 24.

<sup>165</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium*, PG 29:497-670; Milton V. Anastos, ‘Basil’s Κατά Εὐνομίου, A Critical Analysis’, In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. Ed. Paul Jonathan Fedwick, 67-136.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

- 1) God should be described more properly as ‘Father’ (which is in the Bible) not as ‘*agennetos*’ (which is not in the Bible) because Father describes his relationship with the Son as told in the Bible;
- 2) To describe the nature of God as *agennetos* is to apply a term that is not uniquely indicative either of God’s nature or of the seeker’s true piety;
- 3) True knowledge of God’s nature is not available to any human seeker (as it is to the Son and the Holy Spirit as told in the Bible), rather what God chooses to reveal to the seeker are divine qualities like grace and wisdom;
- 4) The Eunomian view that there was difference in nature between the Father and the Son by their sequence in time and creation falls by the wayside when one considers the numerous Bible attestations to God’s being beyond time and creation, also, the Son as the Word was from the beginning ‘with God’ and ‘was God’ (John 1:1); and finally
- 5) Like the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit possesses the same divine nature and is engaged in the same deifying work—to sanctify, teach, and reveal truth—so that seekers may partake of God’s glory.<sup>166</sup>

Basil took care not to bring the Nicene Creed into his debates with the Eunomians nor to be too definitive about the Holy Spirit, and this has led historians to assert a host of reasons for Basil’s caution that range from semi-Arianism to insincerity on his part.<sup>167</sup> Perhaps there are at least two reasons for Basil’s restraint: Firstly, his practice of the principle of *oikonomia* would lead him to employ gentle persuasion; secondly, his concern for the good of the Church would have caused him to intervene cautiously. Because there was a functioning Church for which the Nicene Creed remained in force, one can argue that Basil wisely directed the loci of interventions to areas where he thought he could improve the situation.

In keeping with the dual approaches of *oikonomia* and cautious intervention, Basil was able to lead his opponents along towards the Trinitarian doctrine over

---

<sup>166</sup> Anastos, *Ibid.*

<sup>167</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 29:656-670. Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 123-4.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the course of their debates. He employed *oikonomia* when he argued deftly in the terms, conventions and language of the natural theology of Hellenism. He exercised cautious intervention when he argued delicately for the shared nature amongst the persons of the Godhead, and he took care not to use the highly-charged term *homoousion* too early, until he had brought his opponents all the way to the Trinity.

In the last decade of his life in the 370s, Basil served as Bishop of Caesarea. To his role as *Episkopos*, Basil brought his masterful skill as a Christian rhetor, his prowess as a theologian, and his energy as an administrator of the Christian community. Basil faced what must have been his most formidable problem: How could he bring the Church at large to engage in praxis more in harmony with the true faith? He poured all his rhetorical skill, theological prowess and administrative energy into the tasks of strengthening the Church as a unified body of believing Christians and of intervening to reverse the damage to the Church from Arian incursions.<sup>168</sup>

Basil encountered a bitter demonstration of Arianism's strength in the Church in the struggle over the disputed appointment of the Bishop of Antioch in the reign of the Emperor Valens. Basil had appointed his friend Meletius to fill the see, but the Arians appointed a rival candidate. The long and torturous struggle that ensued involved Pope Damasus in an attempt to resolve the dispute. Ultimately, Basil prevailed in his administrative and doctrinal struggles against the Arians within the Church, but not before he had exhausted himself. He died soon thereafter in the year 379, having successfully defended the Church against the encroachment of Arianism.<sup>169</sup>

Basil of Caesarea wrote three major works on the Trinitarian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In order of importance, these are *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (*De Spiritu Sancto*), *Kata Eunomium Logos G* (*Contra Eunomium – Liber Tertius – De Spiritu Sancto*), and 'Omilia KA: *Kata Sabellianon, kai Ariou, kai ton Anomoion* (*Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos*). Chronologically, the order of these works is thought to run in the following manner. Basil's

---

<sup>168</sup> Meredith, *Op. cit.*, 24.

<sup>169</sup> Meredith, *Ibid.*

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

earliest important work on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, *Contra Eunomium – Liber Tertius – De Spiritu Sancto*, Basil probably wrote in about 364. *Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos* is difficult to date, but considering the technical level of the principles and supporting ideas on the nature of the Holy Spirit, it is probably best to place it in time after *Contra Eunomium – Liber Tertius* and before *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos*, that is, between the years 364 and 375.<sup>170</sup>

In *Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos* Basil turns his pen to a focused discussion of the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. He refers to his opponents by the title ‘Pneumatomachi’ (Spirit fighters),<sup>171</sup> and offers the following descriptions of the Holy Spirit.

- 1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>172</sup>
- 2) The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three perfect incorporeal essences.<sup>173</sup>
- 3) The Trinity includes the Father, Son and Holy Spirit – none of whom are ‘created’.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Paul Jonathan Fedwick, *A Chronology of Basil*. In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. Ed. Paul Jonathan Fedwick, 3-19. Fedwick’s proposed dates for Basil’s three major works on the Holy Spirit are followed in this study with the exception of ‘*Omilia KA: Kata Sabellianon, kai Ariou, kai ton Anomoion (Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos)*’, which on the basis of the technical level of its principles and supporting ideas arguably can be placed between the years 364 to 375.

<sup>171</sup> Basil of Caesarea, ‘*Omilia KA: Kata Sabellianon, kai Ariou, kai ton Anomoion (Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos)*’, Migne, PG 31:613C. Πνευματομάχων.

<sup>172</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:605A. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀπέλθω, φησὶ, παρακαλέσω τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον πέμψει Παράκλητον ὑμῖν. Οὐκοῦν Υἱὸς μὲν ὁ παρακαλῶν, Πατὴρ δὲ ὁ παρακαλούμενος, Παράκλητος δὲ ὁ ἀποστελλόμενος.

<sup>173</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609D. Ὅταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαίρετον μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Ὅπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ πάρεστι δηλονότι. Οὐκ οἶδατε, ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐστὶ; Καὶ, εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός. Ἁγιαζόμενοι οὖν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, δεχόμεθα τὸν Χριστὸν κατοικοῦντα ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν Πατέρα, κοινὴν ποιούμενον τὴν μονὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις.

<sup>174</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:612A. Οὔτε γὰρ ἡ Τριάς μένει Τριάς, ὑφαιρουμένου τοῦ Πνεύματος. Καὶ εἰ ἔν τι πάλιν ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως προσαφθεῖη, πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συνεισελεύσεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

4) There is the Father, indeed having perfect being, in need of no one else, He is the root and fountain of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. There is also the Son, full of the divinity as the living Word, and the offspring of the Father. He [the Son] is full of the Spirit, not part of the other, but is considered perfect and entire in Himself. The Son is, indeed, of the Father, and is joined in being together inseparably. Joined to the Son is the Spirit. There is nothing that invalidates their eternal conjunction; for no age intervenes between them, nor can any think of any separation of mind.<sup>175</sup>

5) For this reason, when by the Spirit we are sanctified, we receive Christ in our inner man, to dwell, and together with Christ, the Father abiding in common with the worthy.<sup>176</sup>

The parallels between this text and that of Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* are clear enough in Hübner's analysis;<sup>177</sup> and these similarities carry forward to the comparison drawn here of ideas about the Holy Spirit. Clearly, Hübner's findings appear to be supported in this comparison. This survey returns to these findings as they were presented above in chapter 1, and examines them in light of their Pneumatological content and treatment. Hübner's comparison of Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* with Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV*

---

και Υιού συναριθμησιν. Τί γάρ κωλύει λέγειν· Πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν· Εἰ γὰρ εὐσεβὲς τὸ πιστεύειν εἰς μέρος τῆς κτίσεως, πολλῷ δήπου σεμνότερον τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν κτί-

σιν εἰς τὴν ὁμολογίαν παραλαμβάνειν.

<sup>175</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609A. Ἀλλὰ τί φαμεν; Ὅτι τὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεῖον ἐντεῦθεν ἐμφαίνεται, οὐχὶ προσώπων σύγχυσις. Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ, τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνεκδέξ, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει θεότητι ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνεκδέξ· πληρὲς δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλὰ τέλειον καὶ ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεωρούμενον. Καὶ συνῆπται μὲν ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ ἀδιαστάτως· συνῆπται δὲ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα. Τὸ γὰρ διορίζον οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ τὸ διατέμνον τὴν ἐξαιδίῳ συνάφειαν. Αἰὼν γὰρ οὐδεὶς μεταξὺ παρεμπίπτει· οὐδὲ μὴν δέχεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπίνουαν χωρισμοῦ, ὥς ἡ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς μὴ συνόντος αἰεὶ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μὴ συνυπάρχοντος τῷ Υἱῷ.

<sup>176</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609C. Ὅταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαιρέτου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβὴς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Ὅπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ πάρεστι δηλονότι.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 108-125; Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28: 117A. Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609C.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

[*Homily 24*], *Contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomoeos*,<sup>178</sup> is addressed in terms of Pneumatological content and treatment.

What appears to Hübner as a lag in logic, where Basil is seen as falling behind Pseudo-Athanasius, could be characterised as a divergence in logic meant to address a later controversy and audience. Basil specifically calls out the ‘Pneumatomachi’ as opponents in his argument.<sup>179</sup> Basil’s divergence in logic would call for a different treatment of text used in common.

The exegeses of passages from Scripture would also call for a treatment in keeping with the demands of the controversy and the character of the audience. Basil makes use of *John* 4:24 and *Romans* 8:9,10 to describe the sanctifying role of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Considering a comparison of texts and ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit, Basil’s use of Trinitarian terminology, thoughts and arguments do not appear to be dependent upon those of Pseudo-Athanasius.

Basil’s apparent tentativeness in arguing for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, does not speak for the priority of Pseudo-Athanasius’ text over that of Basil. This finding too lacks conclusive support from a comparison of texts and ideas on the Holy Spirit. While it is true that Basil describes the Holy Spirit as existing in the fellowship (κοινωνία)<sup>180</sup> of the Godhead, this does not place Basil’s text in a secondary priority to that of Pseudo-Athanasius.

Comparative anomalies in Basil’s wording, especially in Basil’s unexpected use of the term *gennema*, which offended him when Eunomius employed it to support neo-Arian arguments,<sup>181</sup> is a finding that is not conclusively supported by a comparison of the texts and ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Basil uses *gennema* in this instance to show that the Son bears the perfect image of the Father. Basil then extends this perfect image, by way of the Holy Spirit, to the ‘worthy’: When by the Spirit we are sanctified, we receive Christ in our inner

---

<sup>178</sup> Hübner, *Op. cit.*, 47-125.

<sup>179</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:613C.

<sup>180</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:616D.

<sup>181</sup> Hübner, *Ibid.* Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:608A. Διότι γεννητῶς ὑπάρχων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ φυσικῶς ἐκτεπῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς μὲν εἰκὼν, τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχει, ὡς δὲ γέννημα, τὸ ὁμοούσιον διασώζει.

man, to dwell, and together with Christ, the Father abiding in common with the worthy.<sup>182</sup>

### ***Descriptions of the Holy Spirit from the Years 358 to 378***

With the prominent Christian writers introduced, this survey resumes its story of how doctrine on the Holy Spirit emerged and developed during in the twenty-year period from 358 to 378. This enquiry relies on Hübner's route of access to trace the emergence, development and flow of ideas on the Holy Spirit expressed amongst the Christian writers named above. It looks at these descriptions to identify key ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit, to compare these ideas with each other, and to place the Pneumatological content they express in their historical and theological contexts.

At the beginning of this path of development is a description of the Holy Spirit (Second Confession of Antioch in the year 341) that originated with the party of Eusebius, most specifically with Asterius the Sophist, and which Eleusius of Cyzicus and his partisans re-introduced at the synod of Seleucia (in 359).<sup>183</sup>

[No role for the Holy Spirit is described in the Incarnation of the Son.]

[We believe]...Also in the Holy Spirit, who is given to believers for their consolation, sanctification, and perfection; even as our Lord Jesus Christ commanded His disciples, saying, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit' [*Matt. 28:19*]; that is to say of the Father Who is truly Father, of the Son Who is truly the Son, and of the Holy Spirit Who is truly the Holy Spirit, these words not being simply or insignificantly applied, but accurately expressing the proper

---

<sup>182</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609C. Ὅταν οὖν ποτε συνάσωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαίρετου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμός), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Ὅπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ πάρεστι δηλονότι.

<sup>183</sup> 'Dedication Creed of Antioch', first read at Antioch (ca 341), thought to be written by Eusebius of Caesarea and his party, re-introduced at the Synod of Ariminum (ca 359) and proposed by Eleusius of Cyzicus against the proposed Sirmium-derived creed of Acacius of Caesarea. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. II*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:39-40, 69-70. See also M. Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV* (1996) 125-128, 380-385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

subsistence, glory, and order, of each of these who are named, so that there are three in subsistence [*hypostasis*], and one in agreement.<sup>184</sup>

In this creed the phrase, ‘unaltering image of the Divinity’ (τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα) is applied to the Son in relation to the Father.

At the conclusion of the Synod of Ariminum (358), the Homoousion party carried the day. The parties sympathetic to Arian and Homoian ideas, however, out-manuevered their opponents by racing east to the Synod of Seleucia and currying the favour of Emperor Constantius. Thus, the partisans in favour of Arian and Homoian ideas gained official support. Acacius of Caesarea proposed a variant of the creed he had brought with him from Ariminum [a derivation of the ‘Sirmium Creed’].

[No role for the Holy Spirit is described in the Incarnation of the Son.]

...[We believe] also in the Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Saviour has denominated the Comforter, and whom he sent to his disciples after his departure, according to his promise; by whom also he sanctifies all believers in the church, who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>185</sup>

The party led by Eleusius forced the party led by Acacius to state their position that the Son was like the Father only in will, not in substance. After much argument and even more political intrigue the party of Acacius was able to promote yet another version of the creed from Ariminum, with these significant alterations.<sup>186</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. II*, 10, 39-40. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:40, 69. Πιστεύομεν... Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἁγιασμόν καὶ εἰς τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν διδόμενον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διετάξατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς λέγων· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, δηλονότι πατρὸς ἀληθῶς ὄντος πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ ἀληθῶς ὄντος υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἀληθῶς ὄντος πνεύματος ἁγίου, τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶς κειμένων, ἀλλὰ σημαίνοντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ τάξιν καὶ δόξαν, ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.

<sup>185</sup> Socrates *Hist. Eccl. II*, 40; *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:69-70. Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὃ καὶ παράκλητον ὠνόμασεν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐπαγγελάμενος μετὰ τὸ ἀπελθεῖν αὐτὸν πέμψαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῦτο, ὃ καὶ ἀπέστειλεν, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἁγιάζει τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πιστεύοντας καὶ βαπτιζομένους ἐν ὀνόματι πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

<sup>186</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. II*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:71.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

...he [‘the only-begotten Son of God’] was born *of the Holy Spirit* [italics added], and of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh...

...[We believe] also in the Holy Spirit, whom he himself the only-begotten of God, Christ our Lord and God, promised to send to humankind as the Comforter, according as it is written [*John 15:26*], “the Spirit of truth”; whom he sent to them after he was received into the heavens.<sup>187</sup>

In these competing creeds at Seleucia and Ariminum there appear early definitions that represent key pieces of text addressing the nature and activity of the Holy Spirit: 1) It is the Holy Spirit whom the Son of God sends ‘to the human race as the Comforter’;

2) The Holy Spirit’s role in the Incarnation is announced in ‘born of the Holy Spirit’;

3) The concept of the ‘image of the Divinity’ is introduced, here referring to the Son, yet later coming to involve the Holy Spirit.

At the synods of Niké in 359 and Constantinople in 360, a compromise creed emerged that was meant to be acceptable to all, especially Emperor Constantius. The creedal statement, prefaced with an imperial command that it be accepted, went out across the empire to the bishops.<sup>188</sup> The apparent victory of the Homoian cause (and the improved fortunes of the neo-Arian one) in the new creedal statement (a re-worked version of the Dated Creed of Sirmium) raised alarm amongst the Homoiousians.

The version of the Dated Creed of Sirmium adopted at the synod in Constantinople in 360 makes these statements about the Holy Spirit.

[We believe]...We know that this only-begotten Son of God, as sent of the Father, came from the heavens, as it is written, for the destruction of sin and death; and that He was born *of the Holy Spirit*

---

<sup>187</sup> Socrates, *Ibid. NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:71. Maraval and Périchon, *Socrate*. καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ...Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὅπερ αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐπηγγείλατο πέμπειν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων παράκλητον, καθάπερ γέγραπται, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅπερ αὐτὸς ἔπεμψεν, ὅτε ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 2:43; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* 4:26. PG 67, 353; 1197.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

[italics added], and of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh, as it is written...

[We believe]...Also in the Holy Spirit, Whom He Himself the only-begotten of God, Christ our Lord and God, promised to send to humankind as the Comforter [*parakleton*], as it is written, 'The Spirit of truth', Whom He sent to them after He was received into the heavens.<sup>189</sup>

With the nature and role of the Holy Spirit now brought to the fore in the debate, Athanasius of Alexandria developed a doctrine on the Holy Spirit in his *Epistulae ad Serapionem*, which he published in about the year 359. In this work, Athanasius attested to the divinity of the Holy Spirit as a Person in the Holy Trinity.<sup>190</sup> Apollinarius of Laodicea placed the Holy Spirit within the Holy Trinity, albeit with a personal status subordinate to the Son.<sup>191</sup> Basil of Caesarea in his transition from the Homoiousian to the Homoousian view wrote in *Contra Eunomium III* that the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification is evidence of the Spirit's divinity.<sup>192</sup>

The reign of Constantius ended in 361 with his death from an illness. Julian took up rule over the empire and launched a dual campaign to weaken the Church and revive paganism. His brief rule ended a year later with his death on the Persian frontier.<sup>193</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 41, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:71. See also Athanasius, *De synodis* 30, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:466-467. *PG* 26:745. See also J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, (1950/2008) 291-295. Πιστεύομεν...Τοῦτον οἶδαμεν μονογενῆ Θεοῦ υἱὸν πέμποντος τοῦ πατρὸς παραγενέσθαι ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὡς γέγραπται, ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τὸ κατὰ σάρκα,...Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὅπερ αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐπηγγέλατο πέμπειν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων παράκλητον, καθάπερ γέγραπται, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅπερ αὐτὸς ἔπεμψεν, ὅτε ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. For a modern analysis of how the creeds developed in the fourth century at the phrase-by-phrase level by a process described as a 'building-block model' see W. Kinzig and M. Vinzent, 'Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed', *JTS* 50:2 (October 1999) 535-559.

<sup>190</sup> Athanasius, *Epistulae ad Serapionem I-III*, in C. R. B. Shapland, *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (New York: NY: The Philosophical Library, Inc. 1951).

<sup>191</sup> Apollinaris, *Letter 362*, in G. L. Prestige, *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1956).

<sup>192</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *Κατὰ Εὐνομίου (Contra Eunomium III)*, *PG* 29:653A-669D.

<sup>193</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. III*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:95.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

During Emperor Julian's tentative period of peace towards the Church, bishops Eusebius of Vercellae and Athanasius of Alexandria returned from their places of exile in the Thebaid of Egypt and convoked a synod at Alexandria (ca 362) with the aim of restoring their own doctrinal position in the wider church, when for the first time after decades reference was made to the Nicene Creed (or rather to the anathematisms of Nicaea). By that time, there were bishops of prominence amongst those who favoured the Arian, Homoian and Homoiousian views and who publicly denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Synod of Alexandria promoted the definition of the Holy Spirit as a divine and consubstantial Person of the Trinity..<sup>194</sup> The outcomes of this synod then were published in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* in the hope that divisions amongst Christians in Antioch would be addressed in all possible haste. The *Tomus* asks of the Antiochians and indeed all Christians 'who desire re-union' to:

...anathematize the Arian heresy and confess the faith confessed by the holy fathers at Nicaea, and to anathematize also those who say that the Holy Spirit is a Creature and separate from the Essence of Christ. For this is in truth a complete renunciation of the abominable heresy of the Arians, to refuse to divide the Holy Trinity, or to say that any part of it is a creature.<sup>195</sup>

Upon Emperor Julian's death, his Christian successor, Jovian, ruled less than one year but just long enough to reverse the anti-Church policies of Julian. In 364, two brothers, Valentinian and Valens, shared rule over the empire. Valentinian, a Christian sympathetic to the *homoousion*, took up rule in the West; Valens, a Christian favouring the Arian view ascended the throne in the East. Valens went to Antioch to ascertain Persian intentions, and in that city he found an opportunity to discipline the opponents of his favoured Arian bishop Euzoius.<sup>196</sup>

In 365, the party led by Eleusius of Cyzicus took the initiative to gain the upper hand over their opponents, whom at that time included those sympathetic to the

---

<sup>194</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. III*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:81-82.

<sup>195</sup> Athanasius, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:484; *PG* 26:800. μηδὲν πλέον ἀπαιτήσητε παρ' αὐτῶν ἢ ἀναθεματίζειν μὲν τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν, ἀναθεματίζειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λέγοντας κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ διηρημένον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ἀποπηδᾶν ἀπὸ τῆς μυσταῖς αἱρέσεως τῶν Ἀρειανῶν, τὸ μὴ διαρεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα, καὶ λέγειν τι ταύτης εἶναι κτίσμα.

<sup>196</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:96-97.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Arian, Homoian and Homoousion views. They finessed permission from Valens to hold a synod at Lampsacus (on the Bosphorus) at which they affirmed a version of the Antiochian Creed (which they had already done at Seleucia years before in 359); they condemned both the creed ('Sirmium Creed' of 359) and careers of bishops Acacius of Caesarea and Eudoxius of Constantinople.<sup>197</sup>

In 369, a synod gathered by Pope Damasus at Rome affirmed both the Creed of Nicaea and the divinity and unity of substance of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. In his letter addressed to the Church in Illyria, Pope Damasus reports that the 'antidote' to Arian heresy 'consists in the belief, that the Father and the Son have one Godhead, one virtue, and one substance (χρήμα). It is also requisite to believe that the Holy Spirit is of the same hypostasis [substance]. We have decreed that those who hold any other doctrines are to be aliens from our communion.'<sup>198</sup>

In 373, Athanasius of Alexandria passed away. This emboldened Valens to extend his programme of discipline against pro-Nicene Christians beyond Antioch and into Alexandria and Egypt.<sup>199</sup>

Emperor Valens died defending Constantinople from barbarian incursions in 378 CE. Gratian became augustus and, wishing to reverse the pro-Arian policy of his deceased uncle, recalled the exiled bishops whom Valens had driven out of their churches, and promoted a policy of toleration towards all Christian worshippers, except the Eunomians, Photinians and Manicheans. Gratian further recruited his comrade-at-arms Theodosius to be augustus in the east.<sup>200</sup>

Emperor Theodosius convened the synod that has come to be known as the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381 CE, which re-established the Nicene Creed. The so-called 'Macedonian' partisans, led by Eleusius of Cyzicus and Marcian of Lampsacus, and comprising a group of about thirty-six church leaders, were persuaded vigorously by pro-Nicenes. The persuasive

---

<sup>197</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:96-97.

<sup>198</sup> Sozomenus, *Historia Ecclesiastica VI*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:360; see M. Vinzent, 'From Zephyrinus to Damasus – What did Roman Bishops believe?', *SP* 63 (2013): 273-86.

<sup>199</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. IV*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:105.

<sup>200</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. V*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:118-119.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

arguments began with a reminder that they had agreed, by way of Eustathius, with Pope Liberius of Rome that they would accept the Nicene Creed and be reinstated to communion with the orthodox Church. Further, it was demonstrated to them that their retreat from this agreement to a posture of opposition appeared unseemly and even contrary. Determined in their intent to exit from the Nicene fold, these ‘Macedonian’ partisans left Constantinople and then circulated letters to their allies in the churches to have no part in the Nicene Creed.<sup>201</sup>

The newly-appointed bishop of Constantinople, Nectarius, with the remaining bishops assembled at the Council, re-affirmed the pre-eminence of the faith given by the Council of Nicaea. They further declared that heresies are to be condemned and the churches are to be governed in accordance with the ancient canons. With these declarations in place, Emperor Theodosius enacted them [in *Cod. Theod.* xvi.3] to the effect that the Nicene faith is pre-eminent, the churches throughout his dominion are to be presided over by bishops and presbyters who embrace a Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, who have equal honour and power.<sup>202</sup>

At the council the Nicene Creed was enhanced to offer the following doctrine on the Holy Spirit: ‘And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spoke by the prophets.’<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>201</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* V, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:121.

<sup>202</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.* VII, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:381

<sup>203</sup> *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 14:163

### ***Chapter 3: Athanasius' Position in his Epistulae ad Serapionem***

By the year 358, it had become clear to Athanasius of Alexandria that the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit must be defined. At the request of his friend, Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, and by most accounts at some time during his third exile from Alexandria (when he may have been in hiding in the monastic communities in the Thebaid), Athanasius wrote his *Epistulae ad Serapionem*.<sup>204</sup> Athanasius argues in this four-part series of letters for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit as an 'uncreated' member of the Holy Trinity. He warns those who profess a 'created' Holy Spirit, whom he calls 'Tropici' (Trope mongers) and accuses of 'turning' Scripture to illustrate their personal ideas, that they are ignorant of the 'scope of divine Scripture'.<sup>205</sup> The opponents to a divine Holy Spirit included some conservatives and neo-Arians.

This part of the study asks these questions: What does Athanasius argue in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*? How did Athanasius' arguments support his principles on the divinity of the Holy Spirit? What use in common of ideas can be traced in these arguments of Athanasius with those of other colleagues, especially Apolinarius of Laodicea, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea?

What does Athanasius argue in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*?

The key principles of Athanasius' understanding about the Holy Spirit are:

- (1) The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father;
- (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;
- (3) The Holy Spirit gives life;
- (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;
- (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;

---

<sup>204</sup> Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistulae ad Serapionem I-III*, in C. R. B. Shapland, *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (1951); PG 26:517A-570C.

<sup>205</sup> *Epp. ad Serap.* II-III:7; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 162.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

(6) The Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son;

(7) The Holy Spirit ‘in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things’ participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>206</sup>

How did Athanasius’ arguments support his principles on the divinity of the Holy Spirit?

The ideas that form Athanasius’ principles concerning the Holy Spirit can be summarized as follows.

Athanasius draws from Scripture to describe the principle that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father: Father→Son→Holy Spirit. Early in the *Epistle I*, Athanasius distinguishes the Holy Spirit from simply ‘Spirit’ by appealing to the usage in Scripture. He cites the Apostle Paul in his Letter to the Galatians:<sup>207</sup> ‘This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?’ In arguing thus, Athanasius makes two important points: 1) It is usually clear from the usage in the Scriptures when the Holy Spirit is meant; and 2) One must approach Scripture with a sense of the story it tells of faith. Pressing his argument further, and to introduce the overarching theme that the Holy Spirit is proper to God, Athanasius again cites Paul: ‘That the blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith,’ and ‘Because ye are sons [daughters], God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son [daughter]; and if a son [daughter] then an heir of God through Christ’.<sup>208</sup> In this Athanasius presents the *skopos* or ‘story’ of Scripture, and the role that the Holy Spirit plays in that story.

Athanasius traces the divinity of the Holy Spirit through the Son ‘...from our knowledge of the Son we may be able to have true knowledge of the Spirit.’ The

---

<sup>206</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:9, 23; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 82, 127.

<sup>207</sup> *Gal.* 3:2; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:4, PG 26:520B; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 68-70.

<sup>208</sup> *Gal.* 3:14, 4:6-7; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:6, PG 26:523B; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 75. ὁρᾷ δε πῶς καὶ Γαλάταις ἐπιστέλλει λέγων• «ἵνα ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως». καὶ πάλιν• «ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον• ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος, ἀλλὰ υἱός. εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ».

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Holy Spirit belongs to the Son. ‘He [the Holy Spirit] is called Paraclete, Spirit of adoption, Spirit of sanctification, Spirit of God, and Spirit of Christ.’<sup>209</sup> ‘...the Son is called Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father is called Spirit of the Son. Thus the Godhead of the Holy Triad and faith therein is one.’<sup>210</sup> ‘The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.’<sup>211</sup>

To support the principle that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father, Athanasius draws from Scripture the illustrations of ‘fountain and river’ and ‘light and radiance’. Athanasius anchors his argument in Scripture, applying the *skopos* he developed from deep study and complete familiarity with the texts that comprised the Bible of his day. ‘...let him [a seeker] learn only that which is in the Scriptures. For the illustrations they contain which bear upon this subject are sufficient and suitable.’<sup>212</sup>

Athanasius progresses in his illustrations of ‘fountain and river’ and ‘light and radiance’ from the Father through the Son to the Holy Spirit. He begins with the Father. ‘The Father is called fountain and light: “They have forsaken me,” it says [Jeremiah 2:13], “the fountain of living water”,’<sup>213</sup> and again in Baruch, “Why, O Israel, art thou in the land of thine enemies? Thou hast forsaken the fountain of wisdom”,’<sup>214</sup> and, according to John: “Our God is light”.’<sup>215</sup> Athanasius continues his illustrations with the Son. ‘But the Son, in contrast with the fountain, is called river: “The river of God is full of water”.’<sup>216</sup> In contrast with the light, he [the

---

<sup>209</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:11; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 87.

<sup>210</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:16; 103.

<sup>211</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>212</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* II-III:2, 7; 152, 162, see especially note II-III:2.2 on 162. ἀναγκαῖον καὶ ἐκ τούτου δεῖξαι ὅσον πλανῶνται, μὴ εἰδότες τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς θείας γραφῆς.

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.* Jeremiah 2:13. αὐτάρκη γὰρ καὶ ἱκανὰ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς κείμενα περὶ τούτου παραδείγματα. πηγὴ τοίνυν καὶ φῶς λέγεται ὁ πατήρ• «ἐμὲ» γάρ, φησὶν, «ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ὕδατος ζῶντος» (Jeremiah 2:13).

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.* Baruch 3:10-12. καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Βαρούχ• «τί ἐστίν, Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐν τῇ γῇ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εἶ; ἐγκατέλιπες τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας» (Baruch 3:10-12).

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.* 1 John 1:5. καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην «ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν φῶς ἐστίν» (1 John 1:5).

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.* Psalms 65:9. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὴν πηγὴν ποταμός. «ὁ ποταμός» γὰρ «τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπλη-ρώθη ὑδάτων» (Psalms 65:9).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Son] is called radiance – as Paul says: “Who, being the radiance of his glory and the image of his essence”<sup>217</sup>.

Ultimately, Athanasius extends his illustrations to the Holy Spirit. ‘As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance – we must not shrink from saying the same things about them many times – we may see in the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened.’<sup>218</sup> ‘Again, as the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink of the Spirit. For it is written: “We are all made to drink of one Spirit”.’<sup>219</sup>

From Scripture, Athanasius uses the illustrations of ‘fountain and river’ and ‘light and radiance’ to show the principle that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son and that the Spirit is engaged in the activity of the Son. ‘...as the Son is in the Spirit ...so the Father is in the Son’.<sup>220</sup> Again, Athanasius calls upon the Apostles in this instance to illustrate the principle of how the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.<sup>221</sup> In his illustrations, Athanasius presents the Holy Spirit as the ‘drink’ that comes to the believer from the Father as ‘fountain’ through the Son as ‘river’, and as the ‘enlightenment’ that comes to the believer from the Father as ‘light’ through the Son as ‘radiance’.

To support the principle of and describe how the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, Athanasius applies the idea of procession *ekporeúetai* drawn from the Gospel of John.<sup>222</sup> As Prestige observes, ‘The Holy Spirit, in [Athanasius] *Exp. Fid* 4, is a procession (*ekporeuma*) of the Father, ever in the hands of the Father

---

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.* Hebrews 1:3. πρὸς δὲ τὸ φῶς ἀπαύγασμα, λέγοντος τοῦ Παύλου «ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ» (Hebrews 1:3).

<sup>218</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-111, in note I:19.8: Shapland suggests ‘radiance from light’ may be the original meaning of the phrase in the Nicene Creed, *phos ek photos*, rather than a separate light drawn from the source. τοῦ τοίνυν πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ. (τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις). ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ φωτιζόμεθα, Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων• «ἦν» γάρ, φησί, «τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον». πάλιν τε τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ πνεῦμα• γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι «ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν».

<sup>219</sup> 1 Cor. 12:13; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 111-112.

<sup>220</sup> *Epp. ad Serap.* I:19-20, III:1; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-118, 170.

<sup>221</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:6, PG 26:533B; John 16:15; Matt. 3:17; Gal. 4:6.

<sup>222</sup> John 15:26.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

who sends Him and of the Son who sustains Him.<sup>223</sup> In Athanasius, the Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* 3.5).<sup>224</sup>

Athanasius bases the principle that the Holy Spirit is the ‘giver of life’ *zoopoión* on *Romans* 8:11.<sup>225</sup> ‘If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.’

In support of the principle that the Holy Spirit is the ‘giver of life’ *zoopoión*<sup>226</sup> Athanasius turns to the Letters of Paul and the Gospel of John. ‘He is called a quickening Spirit. For it says: “He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you.”’<sup>227</sup> ‘...And as the Lord said himself: “The water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into eternal life... But this he spoke concerning the Spirit which they that believed in him were to receive”.’<sup>228</sup> But the creatures, as has been said, are quickened through him. He that does not partake of life, but who is himself partaken and quickens the creatures, what kinship can he have with things originated? How can he belong to the creatures which in him are quickened from the Word?’<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> Athanasius, *Expositio Fidei* 4, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4: 83-85.

Prestige, G. L., *God in Patristic Thought*, (1936), 251.

<sup>224</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>225</sup> *Rom.* 8:11; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23, *PG* 26:537B; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 123-124, see note I:23.3. πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν λέγεται• «ὁ ἐγείρας» γάρ, φησὶν, «Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν».

<sup>226</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 123-124; In note I:23.3, Shapland explains the idea of the Holy Spirit as ‘quicken Spirit’: ‘The restricted meaning, “bestowing immortality,” was fixed upon *zoopoion* by *Romans* 8:11’.

<sup>227</sup> *Romans* 8:11.

<sup>228</sup> *John* 4:14, 7:39.

<sup>229</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, (1951), 123.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In the principle that the Holy Spirit is ‘unction’ and ‘seal’ Athanasius shows that the Holy Spirit imprints the Image of God borne by the Son upon believers. ‘...the Holy Spirit is ...unction and seal’.

The Spirit is ...seal. ...The seal could not be from among the things that are sealed nor the unction from among the things that are anointed; it pertains to the Word who anoints and seals. For the unction has the fragrance and odour of him who anoints; ... The seal has the form of Christ who seals, and those who are sealed partake of it, being conformed to it; as the Apostle says: ‘My little children, for whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you’.<sup>230</sup>

Athanasius provides support for the principle that the Holy Spirit is unction and seal. ‘Being thus sealed, we are duly made, as Peter put it, “sharers in the divine nature”<sup>231</sup>; and thus all creation partakes of the Word in the Spirit.’ As Shapland observes, Athanasius, in saying that all creation partakes of the Word but then citing *Galatians* 4:19 and *2 Peter* 1:4, seems to refer to redemption rather than creation.<sup>232</sup>

Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy. ‘Therefore, when the Word is in the prophets, they prophecy in the Holy Spirit. When Scripture says “The Word of the Lord came” to this particular prophet, it shows that he [*sic*] prophesied in the Holy Spirit.’<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> 1 *John* 2:27; *Gal.* 4:19; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 123-124. χρίσμα λέγεται τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἔστι σφραγίς. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἰωάννης γράφει• «καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ χρίσμα, ὃ ἐλάβετε παρ’ αὐτοῦ, μένει ἐν ὑμῖν. καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε, ἵνα τις διδάσκη ὑμᾶς• ἀλλ’ ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων» (1 *John* 2:27).

ἡ δὲ σφραγίς τὴν μορφήν Χριστοῦ τοῦ σφραγίζοντος ἔχει καὶ ταύτης οἱ σφραγιζόμενοι μετέχουσι μορφούμενοι κατ’ αὐτὴν λέγοντος τοῦ ἀποστόλου• «τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν» (*Gal.* 4:19).

<sup>231</sup> 2 *Peter* 1:4.

<sup>232</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, (1951), 123-124, in note I:23.8 Shapland sees that Athanasius has a different theme in mind than the expected ‘creation through the Word’ in the tradition of Logos theology. ‘...all creation: This would appear to be a natural extension, in conformity with what is said *infra* 31(143f.) and III:4(173), of the statement in *Contra Gentes* 41, that all creation, in the very fact of its existence, partakes of the Word. But the quotations from *Galatians* and 2 *Peter* suggest that Athanasius is thinking of redemption rather than creation.’

<sup>233</sup> *Ezekiel* 36:26; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:9, I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 81, 144. διὸ καί, γινομένου τοῦ λόγου ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ προφητεύουσι. τῆς γοῦν γραφῆς λεγούσης• «καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου» πρὸς τόνδε τὸν προφήτην, δέικνται προφητεύων ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

‘Thus when the Spirit is said to be in anyone, it means that the Word is in him, bestowing the Spirit.’<sup>234</sup> When the prophecy was being fulfilled, “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh,” Paul said, “According to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ unto me.”<sup>235</sup> Hence, if the saints say, “Thus saith the Lord”, they speak not otherwise than in the Holy Spirit. And if they speak in the Holy Spirit, they speak the things of the Spirit in Christ.’<sup>236</sup>

Athanasius shows the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God in the principle that the Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son. ‘Rather he [the Holy Spirit] is ministered unto with the Son by Gabriel when he says to Mary “The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee”.’<sup>237</sup>

Athanasius supports the principle that the Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son with a reference to the words of the Apostle Paul attesting to the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with the Word and with God. ‘So too when the Word visited the holy Virgin Mary, the Spirit came to her with him, and the Word in the Spirit moulded the body and conformed it to himself; desiring to join and present all creation to the Father through himself, and in it “to reconcile all things... having made peace...whether things in the heavens or things upon the earth”.’<sup>238</sup>

Further to the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. ‘This consideration also shows that the activity (*energeia*) of the Triad is one. ...that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from the one God. Him [the Holy Spirit] therefore who is no creature but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, who is glorified with the Father and the Son, who is

---

<sup>234</sup> See Shapland’s note I:31.17 ‘it means the word is in him: A further illustration of the unity of *energeia* in the Godhead. But, even more significantly, it harmonizes the doctrine of Athanasius with the ‘Paedagogus’ Logosophy of the earlier Alexandrians, notably Clement.’

<sup>235</sup> *Philippians* 1:19.

<sup>236</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, (1951), 145.

<sup>237</sup> *Luke* 1:35; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:11; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 88. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον σὺν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ διακονεῖται παρὰ τοῦ Γαβριὴλ λέγοντος τῇ Μαρίας•«πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ• καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι» (*Luke* 1:35).

<sup>238</sup> *Col.* 1:20; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, (1951), 145-146.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

confessed as God with the Word, who is active in the works which the Father works through the Son.’<sup>239</sup>

Following on the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius supports the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead towards the perfection and renewal of creation.

But if it is by the Spirit of God<sup>240</sup> that we are renewed, then the spirit here said to be created is not the Holy Spirit but our spirit. And if, because all things come into being through the Word, you think correctly that the Son is not a creature: then is it not blasphemy for you to say that the Spirit is a creature, in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things.’<sup>241</sup>

What use in common of ideas can be traced in these arguments of Athanasius with those of other colleagues, especially Apolinarius of Laodicea, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea?

The apparent connections between Athanasius and Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil are worth noting. The acquaintance of Athanasius with the person and thought of Apolinarius predates 346, when Apolinarius was excommunicated by Bishop George of Laodicea presumably for not being loyal

---

<sup>239</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ’ ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ’ ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡταί τῷ πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>240</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:9; Shapland, (1951), 145-146; In note I:9.12 Shapland identifies the ideas that Athanasius presents to carry the force of this principle of the Holy Spirit’s participation in the activity of the Godhead: ‘*But if it is by the Spirit of God*: The following three sentences, all cast into the same form, convey the conclusions, as to Amos 4.13, which Athanasius wishes us to draw from the passages he has just quoted. Firstly, the identification of “thy Spirit” in *Psalms* 104:30 with the Holy Spirit precludes a like interpretation of “spirit” in *Amos* 4:13. Otherwise, we shall be left with an absurdity analogous to that of the “creature-Creator” he has already exposed *à propos* of Arianism, *C. Arianos* II:19-21. Secondly, the perfective and recreative activity of the Spirit, no less than the creative activity of the Word, make it impossible for Him to be a creature. Thirdly, the Tropici should be as quick to draw the right conclusion from *Ezekiel* 36 and *Psalms* 104 as they are to draw the wrong from *Amos* 4:18.’

<sup>241</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:9; Shapland, (1951), 145-146. καὶ εἴπερ, διὰ τὸ πάντα γενέσθαι διὰ τοῦ λόγου, φρονεῖτε καλῶς μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα τὸν υἱόν, πῶς οὐ γενέσθαι διὰ τοῦ λόγου, φρονεῖτε καλῶς μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα τὸν υἱόν, πῶς οὐ βλάσφημόν ἐστι λέγειν ὑμᾶς κτίσμα τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ λόγου τελειοῖ καὶ ἀνακαινίζει;

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

to George's wishes.<sup>242</sup> Apolinarius did not let this deter him from continuing to serve a community of Christians.<sup>243</sup> In the last line of section 9 of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* Athanasius sends his greetings to the Church at Antioch and reports that '...there were present certain monks of Apolinarius the bishop [of Laodicea], sent from him for the purpose.'<sup>244</sup> This places Apolinarius in 362 as a fellow bishop who, like Athanasius, was attentive to the doctrinal disputes that troubled the Church.

Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea and Athanasius commonly held in part, not altogether, some of the key principles about the Holy Spirit. Considering first Apolinarius, it is interesting that his apparent acceptance of the terms of the *Tomus* seem to indicate that he and his followers agreed with the following: 1) 'to anathematize the Arian heresy'; 2) 'confess the faith confessed by the holy fathers at Nicaea'; and 3) 'to anathematize also those who say that the Holy Spirit is a Creature and separate from the Essence of Christ.'<sup>245</sup> Apolinarius participated in the discussion of Christology beginning in the decade before the early 360s, after which, he joined the discussions of pneumatology.

By contrast, Basil of Caesarea emerged as a participant in the Christological discussions in the early 360s, later than Apolinarius had done. Basil's earliest influence probably came from Athanasius, and then influence from Apolinarius followed. It was not until Basil contemplated the writing of his *Contra Eunomium* in the early 360s that he actively sought advice from Apolinarius. Basil extended his efforts into pneumatology in the 370s and after he had become Bishop of Caesarea. In this later period he began to distance himself from Apolinarius and his views especially about the Incarnation. In his *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (*De Spiritu Sancto*) Basil carried forward arguments in pneumatology that were based upon some of the principles that Athanasius had established a decade earlier in the *Epistulae ad Serapionem*.

---

<sup>242</sup> Sozomenus, *H.E.* 6:25

<sup>243</sup> Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (1956), 8.

<sup>244</sup> *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:481-486; *PG* 26:795-810.

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

The modern scholars Reinhard M. Hübner and Volker H. Drecolll have made inroads in the search for the connections of ideas and texts between Athanasius, Apolinarius of Laodicea, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea, as outlined in chapter 1. The Hübner and Drecolll findings are useful in this study where they shed light on the possible flow of ideas between Athanasius, Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil in discussions of pneumatology. Since Basil of Caesarea made a brief contribution to the discussion of pneumatology in the early 360s with *Contra Eunomium Liber III* and it was not until later in the 370s that his more substantial contribution came with the *De Spiritu Sancto*, his ideas will be examined in this discussion after those of Athanasius, Apolinarius and Pseudo-Athanasius.

Hübner has provided a way of approach to view the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the writings of Athanasius, Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil. Along this route Hübner has:

- (1) Identified the key works where development of similar thoughts on the Trinity is evident;
- (2) Compared these with other works in which similar ideas on the Trinity are described; and
- (3) Placed these works and the ideas they present in their historical and theological contexts.

This enquiry follows Hübner's route of access to trace the emergence, development and flow of ideas on the Holy Spirit expressed amongst the writers named above *and* in reply to their opponents. Further to the purpose, this survey sets out to:

- (1) Search the key works, identified by Hübner, for content on the development of the doctrine on the divinity of the Holy Spirit;
- (2) Compare these works with others in which ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit are discussed;

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

(3) Place these works and the pneumatological content they express in their historical and theological contexts.

Hübner's findings that bear directly upon the possible use in common of ideas between Athanasius and Apolinarius of Laodicea can be summarized in the following.

According to Hübner, the Christology (in the early 360s) of Apolinarius is obviously already very developed, but the treatise does not yet entirely reveal the fixed Christological interest, Apolinarius' *Letter to the Emperor Jovian* is currently dated from the year 363. In the sentence in *Contra Sabellianos* 6 (108A): '... whoever says that there is an unbegotten (*agenneton*) God and another produced (*genneton*) God also teaches two gods because the difference of ousia which he introduces is blasphemous', can be an indication of the divisive controversy with Aetius or also Eunomius. The Trinitarian formula 'one ousia - three hypostases' is not met as such, but the corresponding objective teaching of Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three persons in one ousia exists. The remarks in *C. Sabell.* 7 (108C - 109A) on the eternal perfection of the Trinity, with which nothing could be summed created beings, such as the baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) proves, and which is beyond any 'authority and power and dominion' (cf *Eph.* 1:21) – in which no angel had been counted, seems to reveal an awareness of the confrontation with the Tropicci. The argument of Athanasius in the *Letters to Serapion* is also terminologically and factually similar. And *C. Sabell.* 12 (116C - 117A) on the common dwelling and the uniqueness of the *energeia* of the Trinity, which Athanasius argued in the same letters, is best understood as an echo of the controversy over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. All this taken together places them to about the years 358-363.<sup>246</sup>

By way of Hübner's route into these texts, this enquiry then proceeds to identify, compare and place pneumatological content, with particular focus on that of Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Athanasius. A fuller comparison of key ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the texts of these writers follows

---

<sup>246</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 249-250.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

later in this chapter. Here it is useful to illustrate the approach of this study with a concise example.

The search for connections of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit can begin from where Hübner found them in the Pseudo-Athanasian text of *Contra Sabellianos*:<sup>247</sup>

(1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>248</sup>

(2) The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>249</sup>

(3) That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>250</sup>

(4) God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the one activity is differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o*.<sup>251</sup>

(5) This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>252</sup>

(6) The Father exists and has perfect and unfailing being, the root and source of the Son and the Spirit. The Son also exists in full deity, the living Word and Offspring without lack of the Father. And the Spirit of the Son is also perfect, not a part of the other [i.e. of the Son], but complete in himself. And thus the Triad

---

<sup>247</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>248</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79. *PG* 28:100D-101A. Cf. Lienhard, "Ps-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*, and Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*: Analysis and Comparison", (1986), 365-389.

<sup>249</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 230, 242. *PG* 28:112D; 113A; 113C. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>250</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105. *PG* 28:116A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>251</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-110 (Please check this reference). *PG* 28: 113A; 117A; 117B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>252</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 106. *PG* 28:116C. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

truly exists and is indivisibly united. For there is nothing that divides it, and it coexists eternally, since no time occurs between [the persons].<sup>253</sup>

(7) God's activity is one and indivisible, God's *eidos* or form (that which humankind can perceive in God) is one. God is one *physis* (immanently) and one *eidos* (economically) with one *energeia* in three *prosopa*; the characteristics of the three *prosopa* are distinguished by the prepositions *ek*, *dia* and *en*.<sup>254</sup>

While in Hübner's discussion this content was compared with that of Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV*, the key ideas on the Holy Spirit, which Hübner found in Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos*, can be compared readily with those in Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem*.<sup>255</sup>

This study notes the affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where Pseudo-Athanasius (Hübner's 'Apolinarius') in *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*:

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*

(1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>256</sup> In Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.* a related principle states that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father.

---

<sup>253</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105-106. PG 28:116A-B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>254</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-110 (Please check this reference). PG 28:117A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>255</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 90-100, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>256</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79. PG 28:100D-101A. "Ὅταν οὖν περὶ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ, «Ἐγώ,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς, «Ἐκεῖνος,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, «ἄλλος.» πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία, καὶ μόνον εἶναι λέγειν τὸν φάσκοντα. «Οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, ὅτι ὁ πέμψας με Πατὴρ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν.» Cf. Lienhard, "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison", (1986), 365-389.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*

(2) The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>257</sup>

Athanasius speaks further in support of the 'Holy Triad' with an illustration of the Holy Spirit: 'As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance ...we may see in the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened.'<sup>258</sup>

(3) That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>259</sup>

By way of the illustrations of 'fountain and river' and 'light and radiance', Athanasius shows the principle that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son and that the Spirit is engaged in the activity of the Son. '...as the Son is in the Spirit ...so the Father is in the Son'.<sup>260</sup>

<sup>257</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 230, 242. PG 28:112D. 'Ἀνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἀνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννᾶν ὑποπεύσεως. Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ ψευδεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἄθεοι λογισμοί, περὶ τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σε σκανδαλίζουσι. Συνεξήρνηται δέ σοι μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, διὰ τοῦ ὕφ' ἐνὸς προκατέχεσθαι πάντα τοῦ Πατρὸς.' 113A-B. 'Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.' 113C. 'Δῶμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς βραχείας τινὰς εἰκόνας ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀσωμάτων, τινῶν ἐπιμνησθέντες πραγμάτων, ἃ δὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως φαίνεται, εἴ πως δυνηθεῖεν διὰ τούτων ἀναβαίνοντες ἐννοῆσαι πως τὸ ἀσώματον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι τόπους αὐτῶν, μηδὲ τοπικὰς διαίρέσεις τῆς Τριάδος ἐπινοεῖν.' Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>258</sup> *Epp. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-111, in note I:19.8: Shapland suggests 'radiance from light' may be the original meaning of the phrase in the Nicene Creed, *phos ek photos*, rather than a separate light drawn from the source. τοῦ τοίνυν πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ. (τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις). ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ φωτίζόμεθα, Χριστὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων· «ἦν» γάρ, φησί, «τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον». πάλιν τε τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ πνεῦμα· γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι «ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν».

<sup>259</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105. PG 28:116A-B. 'Πόσος γὰρ ἂν τῷ μεγέθει γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, ἐξήρκεσεν εἰς τὴν τοσούτων ὑποδοχὴν, εἰ τόποις μεμερισμένοις τῶν θεωρημάτων ἕκαστα εἶχεν; Ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέηται πλείονων τόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*

(4) God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the *hypostases* [Persons] are differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o.*<sup>261</sup>

Athanasius connects in two ways with the Pseudo-Athanasian idea of the unity of activity in the Trinity and the distinction of the Persons. Firstly, in support of the principle of the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one.'<sup>262</sup> Secondly, he distinguishes the Person of the Holy Spirit, 'The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.'<sup>263</sup>

---

ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τόποις διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱὸν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτω· ὅτι μηδὲ ἔστι τόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστω. Ἀλλ' ἔστι μὲν ὁ Πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνελλιπὲς, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει τῇ θεότητι, ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνενδεές· πλήρες δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐ μέρος ἑτέρου, ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ Τριάς, ἀληθινῶς οὕσα, συνῆπται μὲν ἀδιαστάτως.' Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>260</sup> *Epp. ad Serap.* I:19-20, III:1; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-118, 170.

<sup>261</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. PG 28:113A-B. 'Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτὲ ἔστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.' 117A. 'Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.' 117B. 'Καὶ μὴν ὅτι οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος πρὸς Γαλάτας δις συγχαίρεται. Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁμῶνυμος ἡμῖν, δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος γηγενής, καὶ ὁ μὲν ψυχὴ ζῶσα, ὁ δὲ Πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>262</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἔστι. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*

(5) This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>264</sup>

In his illustrations, Athanasius presents the Holy Spirit as the 'drink' that comes to the believer from the Father as 'fountain' through the Son as 'river', and as the 'enlightenment' that comes to the believer from the Father as 'light' through the Son as 'radiance'. Athanasius illustrates this activity of the Holy Spirit as given in *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.<sup>265</sup>

---

ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἡνῶται τῷ πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>263</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>264</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 106. *PG* 28:116C-D. 'Μὴ τοίνυν ὡς ἐνσώματα ἀδιαίρετα μέρη φανταζόμεθα τρία. Δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς, ἀλλότριος ἀσωμάτων τελείων. Ἀδιαίρετον δεχόμεθα συνουσίαν συνόντων ἀλλήλοις ἀδιαστάτως, καὶ τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑφεστώτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα φοροῦντες φοροῦσι Χριστόν· «Εἰ γάρ τις,» φησὶ, «Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης· «Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκουμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.» Καὶ ναὸν μὲν ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ὁ Παῦλος ὀνομάζει, Χριστὸν δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι λέγει. Χριστοῦ δὲ οἰκοῦντος εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Θεὸς ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν· «Οὐκ οἶδατε, γὰρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.» Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>265</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:6, *PG* 26:533B; *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*

(6) The Father exists and has perfect and unfailing being, the root and source of the Son and the Spirit. The Son also exists in full deity, the living Word and Offspring without lack of the Father. And the Spirit of the Son is also perfect, not a part of the other [i.e. of the Son], but complete in himself. And thus the Triad truly exists and is indivisibly united. For there is nothing that divides it, and it coexists eternally, since no time occurs between [the persons].<sup>266</sup>

Athanasius touches on this unity of being in the Trinity with, 'Again, as the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink of the Spirit. For it is written: "We are all made to drink of one Spirit"'.<sup>267</sup>

(7) God's activity is one and indivisible, God's *eidos* or form (that which humankind can perceive in God) is one. God is one *physis* (immanently) and one *eidos* (economically) with one *energeia* in three *prosopa*; the characteristics of the three *prosopa* are distinguished by the prepositions *ek*, *dia* and *en*.<sup>268</sup>

The Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*Ep. ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* 3.5).<sup>269</sup>

1) The baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) is cited to show that the Holy Spirit is with the divine Trinity and not amongst created beings;

---

<sup>266</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105-106. PG 28:116A-B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>267</sup> 1 *Cor.* 12:13; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 111-112.

<sup>268</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. PG 28:117A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>269</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

For always the Trinity is the Trinity, nor is divinity ever added. Nor was the Son ever without the Father, nor later added to Him, neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit is added. For the things that proceed from the first Principle were made, and they are the workers, and are subject to God, and the Trinity in no way expands. 'Go,' He says, 'make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and the Holy Spirit.' (*Matt.* 28:19) (108D)<sup>270</sup>

2) The Holy Spirit is shown to be a distinct Person of the Trinity sharing the full divinity in essence of the Father and the Son.

Do not, therefore, as it were, think that we imagine three undivided members in the body. For such a thought is impious, the possessions of others from the perfect incorporeal. We admit undivided coexistence of those who are into each other, without any distance, and when the three are in fact in existence- we understand one form, which begins from the Father, shines forth in the Son, and is manifested by the Holy Spirit. For this reason, they say of the Spirit that Christ, too, bears witness for Him, for He says, 'If any one does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His;' and 'but if Christ be in you, though the body indeed is dead because of sin,' (*Rom.* 8:9,10) and so on. And John: 'From this we recognize that He is in us, by the Spirit which He has given us.' (1 *John* 4:13) And, indeed, our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit, Paul calls Christ, moreover, to be in us says: But in Christ, that dwell in our inner man, as it is written, it is God who dwells in us, for, 'Do you not know,' he says, 'that you are God's temple, and the Spirit of God dwells in you.' (1 *Cor.* 3:16) (116C-D)<sup>271</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos* 7 PG 28:108D. 'Ἀεὶ γὰρ Τριάς ἡ Τριάς, καὶ προσθήκην θεότητος οὐ λαμβάνει. Οὐδ' ὁ μὴ πρότερον ὢν σὺν τῷ Πατρὶ προστίθεται ὕστερον ὁ Υἱός, οὐδὲ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐπιγίνεται. Τὰ γὰρ ἀπὸ τινος ἀρχῆς γεγενημένα καὶ ποιήματά ἐστι καὶ δοῦλα, καὶ τῇ Τριάδι συναριθμεῖται οὐδαμῶς. «Πορευθέντες γὰρ,» φησί, «μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.»'

<sup>271</sup> *Op. cit.*, 12 PG 28:116C-117A. 'Μὴ τοίνυν ὡς ἐνσώματα ἀδιαίρετα μέρη φανταζόμεθα τρία. Δυσσεβὴς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς, ἀλλότριος ἀσωμάτων τελείων. Ἀδιαίρετον δεχόμεθα συνουσίαν συνόντων ἀλλήλοις ἀδιαστάτως, καὶ τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑφεστώτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα φοροῦντες φοροῦσι Χριστόν· «Εἰ γὰρ τις,» φησί, «Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης· «Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκουμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.» Καὶ ναὸν μὲν ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ὁ Παῦλος ὀνομάζει, Χριστόν δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι λέγει. Χριστοῦ δὲ οἰκοῦντος εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Θεός ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν· «Οὐκ οἶδατε, γὰρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.» Οὕτως μοι τὸ τῆς θεότητος ἀδιαίρετον εὐσεβῶς ἐκ τῶν θείων λόγων καταμάνθανε, ἐν τρισὶν ἐν

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Further connections of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit continue from where Hübner found them in the Pseudo-Athanasian text of *Contra Sabellianos*:<sup>272</sup>

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>273</sup>

Since, therefore, in reference to himself, he says: ‘I’, of the Father, ‘He’, of the Holy Spirit, ‘Another’ (*John* 14:16), is it not the most open defection and apostasy to deny three persons, and to say that he was the only who says, ‘I am not alone, because the Father who sent me is with me’ (*John* 8:16).

In Athanasius’ *Epp. ad Serap.* a related principle states that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. Athanasius presents the supporting idea that ‘...the Son is called Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father is called Spirit of the Son. Thus the Godhead of the Holy Triad and faith therein is one.’<sup>274</sup> While Pseudo-Athanasius has made both claims (he did so in separate parts of his text), Athanasius combines them and draws an argument from their parallelism which is absent in Pseudo-Athanasius. Although for Pseudo-Athanasius the Spirit is that of the Son, he does not conclude that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. Where Pseudo-Athanasius works from *John* 14:16, Athanasius supports this principle and supporting ideas with references to *Galatians* 3:2; 3:14; 4:6-7.

---

εἶδος κατανοῶν, οὐχ ἓν ἐκ τριῶν πρᾶγμα συντιθείς. Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὴ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.’

<sup>272</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>273</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79. *PG* 28:100D-101A. “Ὅταν οὖν περὶ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ, «Ἐγώ,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς, «Εκεῖνος,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, «ἄλλος,» πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία, καὶ μόνον εἶναι λέγειν τὸν φάσκοντα· «Οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, ὅτι ὁ πέμψας με Πατὴρ μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστι.» Cf. Lienhard, “Ps-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*, and Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*: Analysis and Comparison”, (1986), 365-389.

<sup>274</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:16; 103.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (2) The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>275</sup>

Take away from me any notions of place or time when you consider questions of God, the Word, and of the Holy Spirit. Take away separations in locale, and do not believe that the Father is in a different place to give away his Son to another place, when he generates him. For lies of this kind are impious reasonings, for about the substance of the Son you are in scandalous offense. In company with the Son is the Holy Spirit, being before all time from the only Father of all. (112D)

The same cause must be said of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit, the God of all things; and He has created, preserves and contains these. It is impious, therefore, to look for, or to think, where to find God, as if it is easy to know that there is a place for Him, and to possess the Word, or in what habitation the Holy Spirit is found. (113A-B)

Let us give them the tiny number of images, occurring from the incorporeal, and let them be mindful of the work, which with us is commonly understood and appears in the nature of things. If somehow they become able to understand the works have come forth from the incorporeal Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, they would not invent places for location or contrive of division in the Trinity. (113C)

Athanasius speaks further in support of the ‘Holy Triad’ with an illustration of the Holy Spirit: ‘As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance – we must not shrink from saying the same things about them many times – we may see in

---

<sup>275</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 230, 242. PG 28:112D. ‘Ἄνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἄνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννᾶν ὑποπτεύσης. Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ ψευδεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἄθεοι λογισμοὶ, περὶ τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σε σκανδαλίζουσι. Συνεξήρνηται δέ σοι μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, διὰ τοῦ ὕφ’ ἐνὸς προκατέχεσθαι πάντα τοῦ Πατρὸς.’ 113A-B. ‘Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληγεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.’ 113C. ‘Ἰδοὺ δὲ αὐτοῖς βραχείας τινὰς εἰκόνας ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀσωμάτων, τινῶν ἐπιμνησθέντες πραγμάτων, ἃ δὴ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ὄντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως φαίνεται, εἴ πως δυνήθεϊεν διὰ τούτων ἀναβαίνοντες ἐννοῆσαι πῶς τὸ ἀσῶματον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι τόπους αὐτῶν, μηδὲ τοπικὰς διαιρέσεις τῆς Τριάδος ἐπινοεῖν.’ Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened.’<sup>276</sup> In this imagery, Athanasius calls upon 1 *Corinthians* 12:13 to emphasize the believer’s experience of the Trinity as ‘Spirit’.

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (3) That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>277</sup>

For what man has been so great, who is suitable to hear so many wisdoms, who has divided against himself at the location of each of the speculations? Since, then, the spiritual things that are here, very many though they are, however, are not in need of so many places, but in the understanding they are engaged in one and the same; to understand those things which are above us, as they are incorporeal, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, nor do they stand in need of localities, and are not to be separated into places, nor does any man dare to think that for this reason the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit do not exist, that they can not be defined nor ascribed to separate places. But the Father who is of course perfect, who has a perfect essence, is the root and source of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: and He is in the full divinity of the Son, the living Word, and the offspring of the Father without need. He is also in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit to the Son, not the part of the other, but in Himself integral. And after this, the Trinity, which in fact exists, without any separation in time. (116A-B)

---

<sup>276</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-111, in note I:19.8: Shapland suggests ‘radiance from light’ may be the original meaning of the phrase in the Nicene Creed, *phos ek photos*, rather than a separate light drawn from the source. τοῦ τοίνυν πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ. (τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις). ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ φωτιζόμεθα, Χριστός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων• «ἦν» γάρ, φησί, «τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον». πάλιν τε τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ πνεῦμα• γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι «ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν».

<sup>277</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105. *PG* 28:116A-B. ‘Πόσος γὰρ ἂν τῷ μεγέθει γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, ἐξήρκεσεν εἰς τὴν τοσοῦτων ὑποδοχὴν, εἰ τόποις μεμερισμένοις τῶν θεωρημάτων ἕκαστα εἶχεν; Ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέηται πλειόνων τόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὰ ὄντα ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τόποις διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱόν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτω· ὅτι μηδὲ ἔστι τόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστῳ. Ἀλλ’ ἔστι μὲν ὁ Πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνελλιπὲς, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει τῇ θεότητι, ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνενδεές· πλήρες δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλ’ ὁλόκληρον ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ Τριάς, ἀληθινῶς οὐσα, συνῆπται μὲν ἀδιαστάτως.’ Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

By way of the illustrations of ‘fountain and river’ and ‘light and radiance’, Athanasius shows the principle that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son and that the Spirit is engaged in the activity of the Son. ‘...as the Son is in the Spirit ...so the Father is in the Son’.<sup>278</sup>

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (4) God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the *hypostases* [Persons] are differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o.*<sup>279</sup>

The same cause must be told also of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit, the God of all things, and He has created, and contains these preserves. It is impious, therefore, to look for, or to think, where to find the place of God, or whether it be easy to know such a place for Him, and locate the Word or an habitation for the Holy Spirit. (113A-B)

Indivisible should be it even of persons in the operation, from the Apostle, in these words the mysteries of the teaching of these things you may hear: ‘there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; And there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord: and there are diversities of operations, but the same God, who works all in all.’ (1 *Cor.* 11:4-6) And after he had reviewed, he adds: ‘Now all these things are the work of the one and selfsame Spirit, dividing to every human severally as he will.’ (1 *Cor.* 11:11) But since God deals with all things are through Christ in the Holy Spirit undivided, I see the working of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Spirit. (117A)

And, indeed, not only a man was our Lord Jesus Christ, the Apostle Paul confirms to the Galatians; but even if his second name for us is

---

<sup>278</sup> *Epp. ad Serap.* I:19-20, III:1; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-118, 170.

<sup>279</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. *PG* 28:113A-B. ‘Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.’ 117A. ‘Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαίρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὴ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαίρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαίρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.’ 117B. ‘Καὶ μὴν ὅτι οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος πρὸς Γαλάτας δισχυρίζεται. Ἄλλ’ εἰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁμώνυμος ἡμῖν, δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐχ οἶος ὁ πρότερος γηγενής, καὶ ὁ μὲν ψυχὴ ζῶσα, ὁ δὲ Πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

man: but I do not what manner of man he was, the first is the earthly, for, indeed, there is life, but this man has the Spirit giving life. (*PG* 28:117D)

Athanasius connects in two ways with the Pseudo-Athanasian idea of the unity of activity in the Trinity and the distinction of the Persons. Firstly, in support of the principle of the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one.'<sup>280</sup> Secondly, he distinguishes the Person of the Holy Spirit, 'The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.'<sup>281</sup> Here, Athanasius works from 1 *Corinthians* 12:4-6 to show that the gifts which originate with the Father are given through the Son and distributed by the Holy Spirit.

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (5) This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>282</sup>

Do not, therefore, as it were, think that we imagine three undivided members in the body. For such a thought is impious, the possessions of others from the incorporeal perfect. We admit coexistence with an undivided of those who are into each other, coexist, without any distance, and when the three is in fact in existence- we understand one form, which begins from the Father, shines forth in the Son, and is

---

<sup>280</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοῖνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡς πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>281</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>282</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 106. *PG* 28:116C-D. 'Μὴ τοῖνυν ὡς ἐνσώματα ἀδιαίρετα μέρη φανταζόμεθα τρία. Δυσσεβὴς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς, ἀλλότριος ἀσωμάτων τελείων. Ἀδιαίρετον δεχόμεθα συνουσίαν συνόντων ἀλλήλοις ἀδιαστάτως, καὶ τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὕφεστώτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα φοροῦντες φοροῦσι Χριστόν· «Εἰ γὰρ τις,» φησί, «Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης· «Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκουμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.» Καὶ ναὸν μὲν ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ὁ Παῦλος ὀνομάζει, Χριστὸν δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι λέγει. Χριστοῦ δὲ οἰκοῦντος εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Θεὸς ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν· «Οὐκ οἶδατε, γὰρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.» Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

manifested by the Holy Spirit. For this reason, they say, who is the Spirit, that Christ, too, bears witness to him, for, 'If any one, he says, he does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. If Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead because of sin,' (*Rom.* 8:9,10) and so on. And John: 'From this we recognize, by the Spirit who is in us, which he hath given us.' (1 *John* 4:13) And, indeed, our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit, Paul calls Christ, moreover, to be in us says: But in Christ, that dwell in our inner man, as it is written, it is God who dwells in us for, 'Do you not know', he says, 'that you are God's temple, and the Spirit of God dwells in you.' (1 *Cor.* 3:16) (116C-D)

In his illustrations, Athanasius presents the Holy Spirit as the 'drink' that comes to the believer from the Father as 'fountain' through the Son as 'river', and as the 'enlightenment' that comes to the believer from the Father as 'light' through the Son as 'radiance'. Athanasius illustrates this activity of the Holy Spirit as given in *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.<sup>283</sup>

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (6) The Father exists and has perfect and unfailing being, the root and source of the Son and the Spirit. The Son also exists in full deity, the living Word and Offspring without lack of the Father. And the Spirit of the Son is also perfect, not a part of the other [i.e. of the Son], but complete in himself. And thus the Triad truly exists and is indivisibly united. For there is nothing that divides it, and it coexists eternally, since no time occurs between [the persons].<sup>284</sup>

Athanasius touches on this unity of being in the Trinity with, 'Again, as the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink of the Spirit. For it is written: "We are all made to drink of one Spirit".'<sup>285</sup> Also, Athanasius reinforces the full divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity with, 'But the creatures, as has been said, are quickened through him. He that does not partake of life, but who is himself partaken and quickens the creatures, what kinship can he have with things originated? How can he belong to the creatures which in him are quickened from the Word?'<sup>286</sup> As noted in (2) above, Athanasius works from 1 *Cor.* 12:13 to show that the Holy Spirit distributes the gifts which the Father

---

<sup>283</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:6, PG 26:533B; *John* 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.

<sup>284</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105-106. PG 28:116A-B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>285</sup> 1 *Cor.* 12:13; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 111-112.

<sup>286</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, (1951), 123.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

bestows through the Son, and to emphasize that only a divine Person of the Trinity can do this.

Ps.-Ath. *C. Sabell.* (7) God's activity is one and indivisible, God's *eidos* or form (that which humankind can perceive in God) is one. God is one *physis* (immanently) and one *eidos* (economically) with one *energeia* in three *prosopa*; the characteristics of the three *prosopa* are distinguished by the prepositions *ek*, *dia* and *en*.<sup>287</sup>

In Athanasius, the Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*Ep. ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* 3.5).<sup>288</sup> Further to the Holy Spirit's full divinity, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one. ...that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from the one God. Him [the Holy Spirit] therefore who is no creature but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, who is glorified with the Father and the Son, who is confessed as God with the Word, who is active in the works which the Father works through the Son...' <sup>289</sup> is beyond the created order. Athanasius holds up 2 *Cor.* 13:13, the Trinitarian (or Apostolic) benediction, as a statement of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Who distributes the grace that the Father bestows through the Son on the faithful. 'For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and lambent grace.'<sup>290</sup>

To view the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the writings of Athanasius, Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil, it is useful here to take

---

<sup>287</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. PG 28:117A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>288</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>289</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δεικνύται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοῖνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡς πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>290</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

up a comparison and analysis of Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* with Basil's *Contra Eunomium III*. As discussed above, Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*<sup>291</sup> (ca 361) argues for these principles on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit:

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (1) The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father (on *Galatians* 3:2, 3:14, 4:6-7; 1 *Cor.* 12:13).

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son (on *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6).

Basil of Caesarea in *C. Eunomium III* (written in about the year 364) argues against Eunomius' 'blasphemy' that the Holy Spirit is third in dignity, order *and* nature. Basil challenges Eunomius' claim that this doctrine carries authority from the 'saints'. Basil asserts that both the Son and the Holy Spirit are of the same divine nature (*physis*) as the Father.<sup>292</sup> Basil calls on *Isaiah* 6:3 to support his point that the Holy Spirit has the holiness of nature that the Father and the Son have.<sup>293</sup> Basil builds upon his argument that the three Persons of the Trinity have the same holiness by showing from *John* 4:24 that the Father is referred to as 'Spirit' and from 2 *Cor.* 3:17 that the Son too is called 'Spirit'. This community (*koinonia*) of holiness of nature that the Holy Spirit has with the Father and the Son, Basil says, shows that the Holy Spirit is good in the way that God is good.<sup>294</sup> Basil then uses *John* 14:16 to show that the Son (who Himself was Advocate) would send the Holy Spirit as 'another Advocate' (*Parakleton*), thus showing the glory of the Holy Spirit.<sup>295</sup> Basil proceeds to argue that the Holy Spirit participates in the active work (*energeia*) of God – the Holy Spirit is the

---

<sup>291</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.*; PG 26:520B, 523B, 533B, 537B; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951).

<sup>292</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium – liber tertius*, PG 29:656A-660D. '...Καὶ ὥσπερ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ Υἱός, οὕτω φύσει ἅγιον καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.' See also, M. Anastos, 'Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίον', in P.J. Fedwick, *Op. cit.* (Toronto, 1981), 111-118.

<sup>293</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:660D-661A. 'Εἰ οὖν φύσις αὐτῶ ὁ ἁγιασμός ἐστιν, ὥσπερ Πατρί καὶ Υἱῷ, πῶς τρίτης ἐστὶ καὶ ἄλλοτρίας φύσεως;'

<sup>294</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661A-B. 'Ἐκ δὲ τούτων παντὶ δῆλον, ὅτι οὐχὶ ἄλλοτρίωσιν τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ' οἰκείωσιν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν ἢ κοινωνία τῶν ὀνομάτων παρίστησι.'

<sup>295</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661B. 'Ἐν ᾧ δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος ὅτι, 'Εγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον Παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς εἶναι Παράκλητος ἡμῶν ἐνδείκνυται. Ὡστε καὶ ἡ τοῦ παρακλήτου προσηγορία οὐ μικρὸν πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος συντελεῖ.'

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

‘Spirit of adoption’ (on *Romans* 8:15), a Teacher (on *John* 14:26), a Bestower of grace (on 1 *Cor.* 12:4-6)<sup>296</sup> – and this demonstrates the Holy Spirit’s divinity of nature (*to theion tes physeos*).<sup>297</sup> Basil continues to extol the Holy Spirit’s divine attributes, saying that the Spirit ‘searches the deep things of God’ (on 1 *Cor.* 2:10) and ‘no man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God.’ (1 *Cor.* 2:11)

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (3) The Holy Spirit gives life (on *Rom.* 8:11; *John* 4:14, 7:39).

Basil says that ‘the Spirit within us will quicken our mortal bodies’ (*Rom.* 8:11).<sup>298</sup>

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal (on 1 *John* 2:27; *Gal.* 4:19; 2 *Peter* 1:4).

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy (on *Ezekiel* 36:26; *Micah* 1:1; *Jeremiah* 1:1).

---

<sup>296</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661B-664B. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα τοιαῦτα τοῦ μεγαλείου τῆς φύσεως ἐνδεικτικά· αἱ δὲ ἐνέργειαι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος οἶαι; Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, φησὶν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν, καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν. Ὡς τοίνυν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος δημιουργός ἐστι τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ στερεὸν καὶ πάγιον τῆς ἀρετῆς παρέχεται ταῖς οὐρανίαις δυνάμεσι. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰωβ· Πνεῦμα Κυρίου τὸ ποιῆσάν με· οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς δημιουργίας, ὡς οἶμαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ἀρετὴν τελειώσεως λέγων. Ὁ δὲ Ἡσαΐας ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου διαλεγόμενος, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ δηλονότι, Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με, φησὶ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ψαλμὸς, δι’ ὅλων κεχωρηκέναι δύναμιν τοῦ Πνεύματος παριστάς, Ποῦ πορευθῶ, φησὶ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματός σου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω; Αἱ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ φθάνουσιν εὐεργεσίαι ὁποῖαι τινὲς εἰσὶ καὶ ἡλίκαι; Ὡς περ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν τοῖς δεξαμένοις αὐτὸν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον Πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας ἐστὶ. Καὶ ὥς περ διδάσκαλός ἐστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ καλέσατε διδάσκαλον ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εἷς γὰρ καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός· οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διδάσκειν πάντας τοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου πεπιστευκότας, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου μεμαρτύρηται, εἰπόντος· Ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμπει ὁ Πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα. Καὶ ὥς περ διαιρεῖν τὰ ἐνεργήματα εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τῆς ὑποδοχῆς τῶν ἐνεργημάτων ὁ Πατήρ λέγεται, καὶ διαιρεῖν τὰς διακονίας ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τοῖς τῆς διακονίας ἀξιώμασιν· οὕτω διαιρεῖν καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τῆς τῶν χαρισμάτων ὑποδοχῆς μαρτυρεῖται. Διαίρέσεις γὰρ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαίρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαίρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

<sup>297</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:664B. ‘Ὁρᾷς πῶς καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐνέργεια συντεταγμένη ἐστὶ τῇ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ ἐνεργεῖα; Εἴτα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπαγομένου μειζόνως τὸ θεῖον τῆς φύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φανεροῦται.’

<sup>298</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:664C-665A.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (6) The Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son (on *Luke* 1:35; *Colossians* 1:20).

Athanasius, *Epp. ad Serap.* (7) The Holy Spirit ‘in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things’ participates in the activity of the Godhead (on *2 Cor.* 13:13).

Basil condemns as blasphemous the anhomioian description Eunomius applies to the Holy Spirit, as the Son’s first and greatest creation (*poiema*) lacking divine nature or power.<sup>299</sup> Such a description, Basil argues, does not properly recognize that when the Spirit of God dwells within believers (on *1 Cor.* 3:16) and perfects them, such perfecting activity (*theosis*) is the work of a divine Holy Spirit.<sup>300</sup> The Holy Spirit, Basil says, Who is invoked in the baptismal formula (*Matthew* 28:19) must be divine because only a divine member of the Trinity, not a creature (*ktisma*), is able to bring about the grace of this holy rite.<sup>301</sup> Basil argues against Eunomius’ conclusion that if only God is *anarchos* and *agennetos* and only the Son is *gennema* then that leaves the Holy Spirit to be *ktisma* and *poiema*. Basil replies that since the sanctifier is above those that are sanctified, the teacher is above those that are taught, and the revealer is aware of what is revealed, then the Spirit must be above creation.<sup>302</sup> Eunomius supports his conclusion that the Spirit is a created being with exegeses from two Bible [Septuagint] verses: *Amos* 4:13 and *John* 1:3 to show in the first instance that God ‘creates the spirit’ (*Amos* 4:13) and, in the second, God ‘made all things’ (*John* 1:3). Basil challenges Eunomius’ interpretation of the text of *Amos* 4:13 on the basis that an action of creation of the Spirit (*pneuma*) would have been

---

<sup>299</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665A-B.

<sup>300</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665B-C.

<sup>301</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665C-D. ‘Ὁ γὰρ χάριτι θεοποιούμενος τῆς μεταπτωτῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως, ἐξ ἀπροσεξίας ποτὲ καὶ ἀπορρέουσιν τοῦ κρείττονος. Τοῦτο δὲ σαφῶς μάχεται τῇ παραδόσει τοῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος. Πορευθέντες, φησὶ, βαπτίζετε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἔστι γὰρ τὸ βάπτισμα σφραγὶς τῆς πίστεως, ἡ δὲ πίστις θεότητος συγκατάθεσις. Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον, εἴτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι. Τὸ δὲ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου παράδοσιν, εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· οὐδενὸς κτίσματος, οὐδὲ δούλου Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συντεταγμένου, ὡς τῆς θεότητος ἐν Τριάδι συμπληρουμένης.’

<sup>302</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665D-668C. ‘Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὴν κτίσιν ἐστὶν, ἱκανῶς ἡμῖν παρίστησι τὰ διὰ τῶν Γραφῶν παραδιδόμενα, ἐπειδὴ γε ἀδύνατον τῆς αὐτῆς εἶναι φύσεως τὸ τε ἁγιάζον καὶ τὰ ἁγιαζόμενα, τὸ διδάσκον καὶ τὰ διδασκόμενα, τὸ ἀποκαλύπτον καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως προσδεόμενα.’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

described as a single action occurring in the past; the fact that the verse describes a continuous action in the present clearly indicates weather.<sup>303</sup> Basil then refutes Eunomius' interpretation of *John* 1:3 that amongst 'all things' created was the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit, Basil repeats, by virtue of holiness of nature, is beyond creation.<sup>304</sup>

Drecoll's findings that bear directly upon the possible use in common of ideas between Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea can be summarized in the following.

An informed comparison of the *Epistulae ad Serapionem* with the treatise *Contra Eunomium III* probably does not yield a direct literary dependence. The result of this comparison is the reception of Arian text in *Contra Eunomium I-II*. The comparison with the *Epp. ad Serap.* makes it possible to identify the enemy against whom Basil argues in the treatise. Their profile is a form of theological Pneumatomachianism, which was close to the Tropici (which shows in particular in the use of *John* 1:3), but they are not included with them.<sup>305</sup>

The Tropici are not the same as neo-Arians, as Athanasius himself admits that they respect the position of orthodox teaching on the Son (cf. *Ep. ad Serap.* I.2., 532C, 533A). It was in Athanasius' refutation of the Tropici, along the same line with the Arians, in which he conceived his pneumatology as an extension of his Christology. This shows very clearly in *Ep. ad Serap. II* to *III*. First, Athanasius begins in *Ep. ad Serap. II* on Christology, which he then in *Ep. ad Serap. III* transfers to pneumatology. That Athanasius would then in *Ep. ad Serap. III* base his argument in Christology, however, is not due to a possible influence by Aetius and Eunomius and anhomioian Christology on the Tropici. No one answer precisely explains why he has stayed so long with the argument from Christology. That the Tropici already addressed in *Epp. ad Serap.* are not classified as neo-Arians is covered, the results of literary analysis of *C. Eunom. III* indicate that the arguments in the *C. Eunom. III* treatise are not directed against Eunomian Anhomioians. Conversely, the factual correspondence between

---

<sup>303</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:668D-669C.

<sup>304</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:669C. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον καὶ μόνον, πῶς ὁ τῆς μοναδικῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως, τοῖς πᾶσι συμπαραλαμβάνεσθαι δύναται; Καὶ μηδεὶς οἰέσθω ἀθέτησιν εἶναι τῆς ὑποστάσεως τὴν ἄρνησιν τοῦ κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα.

<sup>305</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, (1996), 138-140.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*Epp. ad Serap.* and the treatise, *C. Eunom. III*, should not be considered as an indication that the Tropici represented an anhomioian theology. In the history of theology, the Tropici are most likely to be classed with a conservative, Eusebian form of the tradition of Origen.<sup>306</sup>

Likewise, the Eusebian - Origen tradition of theology is based on the text found in the *C. Eunom. III* treatise. This treatise is therefore with the *Letters to Serapion* the earliest evidence for a non-anhomioian form of Pneumatomachianism. The fictitious objection with *C. Eunom. III*, 6:2-4 indicates the emphatic use of the Father - Son schemas. The use of *John* 1:3 challenges the assertion that the Spirit, in contrast to the Son, plays no role in creation, so he [the Spirit] falls into the creation. Basil has in mind no function [for the Spirit] in creation, so he interprets *Psalms* 32:6 in a way other than creation (cf. *Ep. ad Serap.* I.31 600C-601A), instead he focuses on sanctification. The principle of unknowability about the *ousia*, set out in *C. Eunom. I-II* to the dissolution of the correlation between *ousia* and *onoma*, is generalized to a skeptic agnosticism. For the theology of the Trinity, it supports the view of one *physis* of the Godhead: How the mind is to think of this obscure existence and therefore how the Spirit of the Father and Son within the Trinity is to be ordered is unclear.<sup>307</sup>

What possible implications can be drawn from the findings of Hübner and Drecoll that bear upon late fourth-century development of orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit?

In Hübner's findings it is constructive to note the affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where Pseudo-Athanasius [Hübner's 'Apolinarius'] in *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*: 1) The baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) is cited to show that the Holy Spirit is with the divine Trinity and not amongst created beings;<sup>308</sup> and 2) the Holy Spirit is shown to be a

---

<sup>306</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, (1996), 138-140.

<sup>307</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, (1996), 138-140.

<sup>308</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos* 7 PG 28:108C-109A.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

distinct Person of the Trinity sharing the full divinity in essence of the Father and the Son.<sup>309</sup>

Hübner's assertion that Pseudo-Athanasius is actually Apolinarius is interesting, but yet remains unproven. His finding that there was a use in common of ideas about the Holy Spirit between Pseudo-Athanasius in *Contra Sabellianos* with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* is supported by the evidence. If these documents were produced in the early 360s and within one to three years of each other then the superior depth and breadth of the principles and ideas in Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* would suggest that the flow of these ideas would more likely to have originated with Athanasius and be 'echoed' by Pseudo-Athanasius.

Drecolt identifies Basil's diversion from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification. Drecolt seems to say that in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* Athanasius directs his lengthy argument from Christology only to those opponents to a divine Holy Spirit who were *not* influenced by neo-Arian ideas; and, as such, Drecolt does not offer a reason why Athanasius would have done so. In making this assumption about Athanasius' opponents, it is possible that Drecolt rules out a promising reason why Athanasius might have chosen to argue labouriously from Christology for the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Drecolt's comments about the ideas that Basil of Caesarea presents on the Holy Spirit will receive more discussion in the next chapter of this study – 'Basil's *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos (De Spiritu Sancto)*'.

The flow of ideas on the divinity of the Holy Spirit can be traced along distinct paths. The ideas that form Athanasius' Trinitarian principles applied to the Holy Spirit appear to varying extent in the pneumatological writings of Apolinarius, Pseudo-Athanasius and Basil. At this stage it appears evident that the prevailing direction in the flow of ideas was from Athanasius outward, first to Apolinarius and Pseudo-Athanasius, later to Basil.

---

<sup>309</sup> *Op. cit.*, 12 PG 28:116C-117A.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Athanasius draws from Scripture to show how the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. The Father is called fountain (*Jeremiah* 2:13; *Baruch* 3:10-12) and light (1 *John* 1:5). By extension, the Son is called river (*Psalms* 65:9) and radiance (*Hebrews* 1:3); so too, the Holy Spirit is drink (1 *Cor.* 12:13) and enlightenment, that is, for identity of divine substance in the Godhead.<sup>310</sup> So too Apolinarius argued in the early 360s in support of Athanasius' view that the *homoousion* means the Son is not just similar to God but *is* God and that the Spirit 'has his being in the same deity'.<sup>311</sup> Apolinarius in *Epistula* 362 made use of similar illustrations drawn from Scripture, as Athanasius had done, in describing the Son as 'light of identical form [with the Father]'.<sup>312</sup> Again similarly to Athanasius, Pseudo-Athanasius (Apolinarius?) in his tract *Contra Sabellianos* (if for the moment one suspends doubt that *Contra Sabellianos* is from Apolinarius) represents the Son as the 'fountain of the Deity', and so argues by extension that this identity of divine substance applies also to the Holy Spirit.<sup>313</sup>

From Scripture, Athanasius applies the idea of procession *ekporeuesthai* drawn from the Gospel of John to describe how the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son (*John* 15:26). In the tradition of Logos theology, Athanasius in *Contra Gentes* had differentiated the Word as Son from the old Stoic concept of 'logos' as the rationality inherent in the created order.<sup>314</sup> In doing so, Athanasius carried forward into the fourth century, the line of thought that begins with Origen.

Athanasius goes much further, however, and sets off on a course that reached beyond the conservatives (like Basil of Ancyra) and the semi-Arians (like Eusebius of Caesarea) who avoided identity of substance in fear of Sabellianism. Consistent with the thought of Origen that the Son and Holy Spirit belong to the Triad with the Father,<sup>315</sup> Athanasius defines the generation of the Son by the

---

<sup>310</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-111; Gal. 4.6. *Ep. ad Serap.* I:11, III:1-7; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 82, 127.

<sup>311</sup> Apolinarius, *Ep.* 364; Prestige, *St Basil*, 45.

<sup>312</sup> *Op. cit.*, 39-43.

<sup>313</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*, PG 28:96-121.

<sup>314</sup> *Contra Gentes* 40; Prestige, *GPT*, 117.

<sup>315</sup> *De Principiis* 1.3.7; Prestige *GPT*, 138-139.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Father as ‘gennema’ rather than ‘gen(n)etos’. In making this distinction, Athanasius shows that since the Father is ‘agen(n)etos’ the Son is eternally begotten (*Contra Arianos* 1.31).<sup>316</sup> When in the 360s Athanasius gives expression to the concept of identity of divine substance in the Trinity, he sets orthodoxy on a new course. As Prestige succinctly describes this departure: ‘Athanasius, like Eusebius, states that the object of his friends was to exclude any description of Christ [and by extension the Holy Spirit] as a creature, or any other distinctively Arian formula. But in doing so he makes it perfectly clear that Christ’s full and absolute deity involved identity, and not mere likeness, of substance with the Father’.<sup>317</sup>

Scholars recently have described Athanasius as a writer resolutely in the tradition of Logos theology. Such descriptions situate him in a system of thought that traces back to Origen; and they carry validity for how Athanasius expressed his thinking earlier in his life. In contrast to such descriptions, however, the thought of Athanasius later in his life, and specifically in *Epistulae ad Serapion*, has led some scholars to suggest that he had changed course and had come to move along a different line of thinking. Amongst those who have observed Athanasius setting off on a new course, Archibald Robertson offers the following description:

The Athanasian idea of God has been singled out for special recognition in recent times; he has been claimed, and on the whole with justice, as a witness for the immanence of God in the universe in contrast to the insistence in many Christian systems on God’s transcendence or remoteness from all created things. ...The Apologists and Alexandrians had partially succeeded in the problem expressed in the dying words of Plotinus ‘to bring the God which is within into harmony with the God which is in the universe,’. ...That solution was found by Athanasius. ...The Divine Will is the direct and sole source of all things and the idea of a *mediatorial nature* is inconsistent with the true idea of God. ...The immanence, or intimate presence and unceasing agency of God in nature does not belong to the Word as distinct from the Father, but to the Father in and through the Word, in a word to God *as God* (cf. *De Decr.* 11, where the language of *De Incarn.* 17 about the Word is applied to God *as such*).

---

<sup>316</sup> *Contra Arianos* 1.31; *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4.

<sup>317</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 213.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

This is a point which marks an advance upon anything that we find in the earliest writings of Athanasius, and upon the theology of his preceptor Alexander. ...This is indeed the principal particular in which Athanasius left the modified Origenism of his age, and of his own school, behind. If on the other hand he resembled Arius in drawing a sharper line than had been drawn previously between the one God and the World, it must also be remembered that his God was not the far-off purely transcendent God of Arius, but a God not far from every one of us (*Orat.* ii. p. 361 *sq.*).<sup>318</sup>

As has been noted earlier in this chapter, Athanasius calls upon the Apostles in this instance to support the principle of how the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son (*John* 16:15; *Matthew* 3:17; *Galatians* 4:6).<sup>319</sup> As Prestige observes, 'The Holy Spirit, in [Athanasius] (*Exp. Fid.* 4), is a procession (*ekporeuma*) of the Father, ever in the hands of the Father who sends Him and of the Son who sustains Him.'<sup>320</sup> In Athanasius, the Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*Ep. ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* III.5).<sup>321</sup>

Neither Pseudo-Athanasius nor Apolinarius seem to offer a definitive statement on the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Athanasius draws from *Romans* 8:11 to show that the Holy Spirit gives life.<sup>322</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius echoes this idea when he refers to the promise of the life-giving Spirit that believers receive through faith in Jesus Christ (*Galatians* 3:14).<sup>323</sup>

Athanasius draws from *Galatians* (4:19) and 2 *Peter* (1:4) to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is unction and seal. In doing so, Athanasius presents the Holy Spirit completing the work of renewal initiated by the Father through the Son.

---

<sup>318</sup> Robertson, *Prolegomena*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4:lxvii, §3.

<sup>319</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19-20, III:1; Shapland, (1951), 108-118, 170.

<sup>320</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>321</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>322</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, (1951), 123-124, see note I:23.3.

<sup>323</sup> Ps-Ath., *C.Sabellianos*, PG 28:96-121.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Pseudo-Athanasius obliquely approaches this idea in his discussion of the identity of substance within the Trinity and how, by way of baptism and the ‘thrice-holy sign’, believers are regenerated into salvation.<sup>324</sup> When Pseudo-Athanasius cites the Apostle Paul’s description of believers being transformed in the image of God, he makes contact with this idea of the Holy Spirit as unction and seal, ‘And all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit’ (2 *Cor.* 3:18).<sup>325</sup>

Athanasius brings forward the prophets (*Micah* 1:1, *Jeremiah* 1:1) to show that the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy. He further illustrates this principle by reference to *Philippians* 1:19. Pseudo-Athanasius does not appear to present any ideas that connect with this principle.

Athanasius cites the Apostle Paul to show that the Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son (*Colossians* 1:20).<sup>326</sup> In this Athanasius presents the Holy Spirit in close relationship with the Word and God.

Along with Pseudo-Athanasius’ discussion of the identity of substance within the Trinity, baptism and the thrice-holy sign is a Scripture reference to the generation of the Son: ‘Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee’ (*Psalms* 2:7; *Hebrews* 1:5, 5:5), which, while it makes contact with Athanasius’ idea that the Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son, does not directly express it in those terms.<sup>327</sup>

Athanasius draws upon *Psalms* 104 and *Ezekiel* 36 to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. By virtue of the Holy Spirit’s participation in the work of the Trinity, is one in divinity and is worthy to be glorified with the Father and the Son.

---

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>325</sup> Ps-Ath., c.*Sabellianos*, PG 28:96-121.

<sup>326</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, (1951), 145-146.

<sup>327</sup> Ps-Ath., c.*Sabellianos*, PG 28:96-121.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Early in Pseudo-Athanasius' argument against the Sabellians, he reminds his audience that the Holy Spirit is the third Person of the Trinity, the Paraclete, whom Jesus Christ promised to ask the Father to send (*John* 14:16).<sup>328</sup> He also shows that the Holy Spirit participates in the renewal of believers when he invokes Christ's baptismal commission to the Apostles (*Matthew* 20:19).<sup>329</sup>

As Hübner has shown, Pseudo-Athanasius presented several ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the later parts of *Contra Sabellianos*.<sup>330</sup> Essentially, the ideas Hübner referenced on the Holy Spirit are those cited earlier in this study:

*John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>331</sup>

The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>332</sup>

That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>333</sup>

God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the *hypostases* are differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o*.<sup>334</sup>

This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>335</sup>

...the Father exists and has perfect and unfailing being, the root and source of the Son and the Spirit. The Son also exists in full deity, the living Word and Offspring without lack of the Father. And the Spirit of the Son is also perfect, not a part of the other [i.e. of the Son], but complete in himself. And thus the Triad truly exists and is indivisibly

---

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>330</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 79, 105-109, 230, 242.

<sup>331</sup> *PG* 28:100D-101A.

<sup>332</sup> *PG* 28:112D.

<sup>333</sup> *PG* 28:116A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 365-389.

<sup>334</sup> *PG* 28:113A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>335</sup> *PG* 28:116C; ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

united. For there is nothing that divides it, and it coexists eternally, since no time occurs between [the persons] (116A-B).<sup>336</sup>

...Despite his distinguishing functions and perceptions by prepositions, however, Ps-Ath. still affirms that God's activity is one and indivisible (117A), and that God's *eidos* or form (what man perceives in God) is one. Ps-Ath.' doctrine of the one divine *eidos* is among the more interesting aspects of his theology. ...The term [*eidos*] may have left too large an opening for modalism. But in Ps-Ath. it represents an early attempt to join the 'theology of prepositions' to a more abstract affirmation of the divine unity. For Ps-Ath. God is one *physis* (immanently) and one *eidos* (economically) with one *energeia* in three *prosopa*; the characteristics of the three *prosopa* are distinguished principally by the prepositions *ek*, *dia* and *en*.<sup>337</sup>

This comparison of texts between Pseudo-Athanasius in *Contra Sabellianos* with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* yields two main findings: 1) As Hübner suggests, there is an affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where content in Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with that of Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem*; and 2) Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* offers a superior depth and breadth of Trinitarian principles and ideas applied to the Holy Spirit. This comparison affirms the view that if these documents were produced in the early 360s and within a few years of each other then the superior development of thought in Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* would suggest that the flow of these ideas is more likely to have originated with Athanasius and then 'echoed' by Pseudo-Athanasius.

Drecoll's findings on Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* show that Basil, like Athanasius, emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit in the activity of God towards sanctification. In this coincidence of ideas too, the source is very likely Athanasius rather than Basil. This survey will consider Drecoll's comments on the ideas of Basil of Caesarea in his *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos (De Spiritu Sancto)* in the next chapter.

It has been shown that when Athanasius gives expression to the concept of identity of divine substance in the Trinity in the early 360s, he sets orthodoxy on

---

<sup>336</sup> PG 28:116A-B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>337</sup> PG 28:117A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

a new course. Athanasius discovered that the same argument for Christ's identity of divine substance with the Father extends to the Holy Spirit.

## ***Chapter 4: Basil's Position in his De Spiritu Sancto***

### ***Basil on the Holy Spirit in his De Spiritu Sancto***

*Peri tou hagiou pneumatos (De Spiritu Sancto)*, which Basil wrote in about the year 375 CE, represents the most mature development of his arguments for the co-equal divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity.<sup>338</sup>

By the year 358, and about sixteen years prior to when Basil of Caesarea wrote *De Spiritu Sancto*, a group of conservative bishops who had formed an alliance around Basil of Ancyra produced an argument in favour of a homoiousion, or 'similar in substance', relationship between the Father and the Son, whereby the emphasis is placed on the Father's role as 'Father' to the Son.<sup>339</sup> This view added a new aspect that was missing in that of the anhomoians who professed, in common with the neo-Arians, that the Father is creator of a 'created' Jesus, about whom one could not speak in terms of 'divine' substance. The homoiousion argument had brought about a significant shift in the technical description of divine 'substance' focusing it on the being, *to einai*, and not just upon the action, *energeia*, of God.<sup>340</sup> By extension, this new use of 'substance' to describe divinity held implications for the emerging discussion of the Holy Spirit. In contrast to the anhomoiian view of the Holy Spirit as a creature different from and subordinate to the Son and by degrees superior to the angels,<sup>341</sup> the conservatives envisioned a Holy Spirit with the role of Paraclete.<sup>342</sup>

---

<sup>338</sup> Fedwick, Paul Jonathan, *A Chronology of Basil*. In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. Ed. Paul Jonathan Fedwick. 2 vols. (1981) 3-19. Fedwick's proposed dates for Basil's three major works on the Holy Spirit are followed in this study with the exception of 'Omilia KA: Kata Sabellianon, kai Ariou, kai ton Anomoion (Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos)', which on the basis of the technical level of its principles and supporting ideas arguably can be placed between the years 364 to 375.

<sup>339</sup> C. R. B. Shapland, *Introduction to The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (1951), 21-22.

<sup>340</sup> R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (2005) 352-357. For a classic exploration of the meanings of *homoousios* see G. Christopher Stead's paper "The Concept of Divine Substance" in *Vigiliae Christianae* 29, no. 1 (March 1975): 1-14.

<sup>341</sup> Shapland, *Op. cit.* 28.

<sup>342</sup> Hanson, *Op. cit.* 364.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

What was the shape of the fourth-century discussion about the Holy Spirit?

The conservatives, in embracing the aspect of divine substance, had moved some distance from anhomioian doctrine, and, in their flight from the neo-Arians, they moved reluctantly closer to the views held by Athanasius of Alexandria and the pro-Nicene party. The pro-Nicenes, represented by their elder statesman Athanasius, describe the Holy Spirit in terms that go beyond divine action to include divine being.<sup>343</sup>

Athanasius laid the groundwork for a consensus in the Church around the view that only a divine Holy Spirit could give life, inspire prophecy and sanctify humankind. He built this consensus upon a foundation of emergent recognition amongst fourth-century theologians that the Holy Spirit is divine.<sup>344</sup>

This part of the study asks these questions: What does Basil argue in *De Spiritu Sancto*? How did Basil's arguments support his principles on the divinity of the Holy Spirit? What use of ideas in common can be traced in these arguments of Basil with those of other colleagues, especially Athanasius of Alexandria and Apolinarius of Laodicea?

What does Basil argue in *De Spiritu Sancto*?

The key principles of Basil's understanding about the Holy Spirit are:

- (1) The Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father;
- (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;
- (3) The Holy Spirit gives life;
- (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;
- (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;

---

<sup>343</sup> Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 32.

<sup>344</sup> J. N. D. Kelley states that in the 'mind of the Church...revealed in its doxologies and the liturgical formulae...' the conceptions of God were 'prevailingly triadic'. J. N. D. Kelley, *Early Christian Creeds* (1950/2008), 152-155.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

(6) The Holy Spirit gives gifts to the ‘worthy’;

(7) The Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead.

In *De Spiritu Sancto* chapter 24, Basil delineates what makes the Holy Spirit divine and worthy of worship. (1) ‘He is good by nature, in the same way as the Father is good, and the Son is good...’ (2) ‘He knows “The deep things of God; (1 *Cor* 2:10,11)”...’ (3) ‘He quickens together with God, who produces and preserves all things alive, and together with the Son, who gives life.’<sup>345</sup>

How did Basil’s arguments support his principles on the divinity of the Holy Spirit?

To support the principle that the Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father, Basil argues that the titles of the Holy Spirit lift one’s attention above the worldliness of the created order to the realm of the divine. ‘First of all we ask, who on hearing the titles of the Spirit is not lifted up in soul, who does not raise his conception to the supreme nature? ...We are compelled to advance in our conceptions to the highest, and to think of an intelligent essence, in power infinite, in magnitude unlimited, unmeasured by times or ages, generous of It’s good gifts,’<sup>346</sup> Once Basil has pointed the thoughts of his audience heavenward, he reminds them that the Holy Spirit is named with the Father and Son in the Apostolic commission. ‘For if our Lord, when enjoining the baptism of salvation, charged His disciples to baptize all nations in

---

<sup>345</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*. In vol. 8 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Basil: Letters and Select Works, Second Series*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. (1886-1889/1994) 36. The editors point out in note 5 on page 36 that in 1 *Timothy* 6.13 Paul writes ‘*to theou tou zoopoiontos panta*’ while Basil writes ‘*ta panta zoogonountos*’; so Basil’s text differs from Paul’s meaning of ‘to make alive after death’ such that Basil conveys the meaning ‘to engender alive’. 1 *Cor* 2:10,11. *PG* 32:172C. ‘Σκεψώμεθα οὖν τὰ κατέκαστον Φύσει ἐστὶν ἀγαθόν, ὡς ἀγαθὸς ὁ Πατήρ καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὁ Υἱός. Ἡ κτίσις δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκλογῇ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μέτοχός ἐστι τῆς ἀγαθότητος. Οἶδε τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἡ κτίσις δὲ λαμβάνει τὴν φανέρωσιν τῶν ἀπορρήτων διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ζωοποιεῖ μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονοῦντος, μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ διδόντος ζωὴν.’

<sup>346</sup> Basil, *NPWF*<sup>2</sup> 8:15. *PG* 32:108A. Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν, τίς ἀκούσας τῶν προσηγοριῶν τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὐ διανίσταται τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνωτάτω φύσιν τὴν ἔννοιαν ὑπεραίρει; ... ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀνωτάτω ταῖς ἐννοίαις χωροῦντα, νοερὰν οὐσίαν ἐπάναγκες ἐννοεῖν, ἅπειρον κατὰ δύναμιν, μεγέθει ἀπεριόριστον, χρόνις ἢ αἰῶσιν ἀμέτρητον, ἄφθονον ὃν ἔχει καλῶν. Πρὸς ὃ πάντα ἐπέστραπται τὰ ἀγιασμοῦ προσδεόμενα· οὗ πάντα ἐφίεται τὰ κατ’ ἀρετὴν ζῶντα, οἷον ἐπαρδόμενα τῇ ἐπιπνοίᾳ καὶ βοηθούμενα πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἑαυτοῖς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν τέλος.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the name “of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (*Matt.* 28:19)”... The Lord has delivered to us a necessary and saving doctrine that the Holy Spirit is to be ranked with the Father.’<sup>347</sup> Keeping the focus above the cosmos, Basil argues further that in the divine realm are three in One: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. ‘For the first principle of existing things is One, creating through the Son and perfecting through the Spirit.’<sup>348</sup> Basil advances to the Holy Spirit’s role in divine action. ‘You are therefore to perceive three, the Lord who gives the order, the Word who creates, and the Spirit who confirms.’<sup>349</sup> Then, Basil completes the proof of the divinity of the Holy Spirit with a statement of faith that identifies this Person of the Trinity in the Godhead. ‘Worshipping as we do God of God, we both confess the distinction of the [three] Persons, and at the same time abide by the Monarchy [of God].’<sup>350</sup>

Basil sets out in his argument to show from the titles by which the Spirit is known that the Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father. In describing the attributes of the Holy Spirit as ‘...an intelligent essence, in power infinite, in magnitude unlimited, unmeasured by times or ages, generous of It’s good gifts,’<sup>351</sup> Basil is asserting the Holy Spirit’s divinity. Then, Basil argues from the apostolic commission *Matt.* 28.19 that Christ attests to the Holy Spirit’s divinity and togetherness with the Father.<sup>352</sup> Basil describes the roles of the Persons of the Trinity beginning with the Father as ‘One’ Who creates ‘through the Son’ and perfects ‘through the Spirit.’<sup>353</sup> He instructs his audience to understand ‘three, the Lord who gives the order, the

---

<sup>347</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:16-17; *Matthew* 28:19. *PG* 32:112A. ‘Εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν Κύριος σαφῶς ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τοῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος προσέταξε τοῖς μαθηταῖς βαπτίζειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη «εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος», οὐκ ἀπαξιών τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸ κοινωνίαν, οὗτοι δὲ μὴ χρῆναι αὐτὸ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συντάσσειν λέγουσι· πῶς οὐχὶ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαταγῇ προδήλως ἀνθίστανται;’

<sup>348</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:23. *PG* 32:136B Ἀρχὴ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων μία, δι’ Υἱοῦ δημιουργοῦσα, καὶ τελειοῦσα ἐν Πνεύματι.

<sup>349</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:24. *PG* 32:136C-D. ‘Τρία τοίνυν νοεῖς, τὸν προστάσσοντα Κύριον, τὸν δημιουργοῦντα Λόγον, τὸ στερεοῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα.’

<sup>350</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:28. *PG* 32:149B-C. ‘Θεὸν γὰρ ἐκ Θεοῦ προσκυνοῦντες, καὶ τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν ὑποστάσεων ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ μένομεν ἐπὶ τῆς μοναρχίας.’

<sup>351</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:15. *PG* 32:108A.

<sup>352</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:16-17; *Matthew* 28:19. *PG* 32:112A.

<sup>353</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:23. *PG* 32:136B.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Word who creates, and the Spirit who confirms.<sup>354</sup> Basil then is careful to restate his confession of belief in one God, discerned in three Persons, while preserving the Monarchy [of God].<sup>355</sup>

To support and illustrate the principle that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, Basil holds up as evidence the procession of the Holy Spirit from God (*John* 15:26) and the flow of divine wisdom and dignity in the Trinity. ‘...He [the Holy Spirit] is moreover said to be “of God;” (1 *Cor.* 2:12) not indeed in the sense in which “all things are of God,” (1 *Cor.* 11:12) but in the sense of proceeding out of God, not by generation, like the Son, but as Breath of His mouth.’<sup>356</sup> Basil illustrates for his listeners that, when the Holy Spirit makes the ‘royal Dignity’ apparent to believers, this further proves the Spirit’s full divinity. ‘Thus the way of the knowledge of God lies from One Spirit through the One Son to the One Father, and conversely the natural Goodness and inherent Holiness and the royal Dignity extend from the Father through the Only-begotten to the Spirit.’<sup>357</sup>

Basil employs the illustration of breath from God to show that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. He describes how this can be understood by invoking the imagery of the breath of God; being careful to differentiate this procession from God of the Holy Spirit (in 1 *Cor.* 2:12) from the things of creation, which are also of God (1 *Cor.* 11:12). Basil carefully differentiates the sense of proceeding out of God as breath rather than by generation, like the Son.<sup>358</sup> Conversely, Basil applies the illustration of breath

---

<sup>354</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:24. *PG* 32:136C-D.

<sup>355</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:28. *PG* 32:149B-C.

<sup>356</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:29; 1 *Cor.* 2:12; 1 *Cor.* 11:12. *PG* 32:152B. ‘Καὶ οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν μόνον τῆς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν κοινωνίας αἱ ἀποδείξεις, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι λέγεται· οὐχ ὡς τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ προελθόν· οὐ γεννητῶς ὡς ὁ Υἱός, ἀλλ’ ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος αὐτοῦ.’

<sup>357</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:29. *PG* 32:153B-C. ‘Ἡ τοίνυν ὁδὸς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἐστὶν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς Πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Υἱοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα Πατέρα. Καὶ ἀνάπαλιν, ἡ φυσικὴ ἀγαθότης, καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμός, καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα, ἐκ Πατρὸς, διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, ἐπὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα διήκει.’

<sup>358</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:29; 1 *Cor.* 2:12; 1 *Cor.* 11:12. *PG* 32:152B.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

from God in reverse to show that the way towards the knowledge of God is by way of the Spirit.<sup>359</sup>

To demonstrate in support of the principle that the Holy Spirit gives life, Basil cites from Scripture that it is by the Holy Spirit that believers are ‘quickened’ *zōopoion* on *John* 6:63.<sup>360</sup> ‘There is close relationship with God through the Spirit, for “God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father (*Gal.* 4:6).”’ Moreover, Basil argues, the action of the Holy Spirit bestows life. ‘The resurrection from the dead is effected by the operation of the Spirit, for “Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created; and Thou renewest the face of the earth (*Pss.* 104:30).”’<sup>361</sup>

Drawing from Scripture, Basil shows that the Holy Spirit infuses believers with life. The Holy Spirit gives life (on *John* 6:63).<sup>362</sup> As such, this places the Holy Spirit with the Godhead, for only God can give life. Basil reminds his readers by way of *Gal.* 4:6 that it is the Holy Spirit that dwells in believers and inspires them to acknowledge God as their Father. Basil applies *Psalms* 104 to show the Holy Spirit’s activity in both the creation and renewal of life.<sup>363</sup>

In support of the principle that the Holy Spirit is unction and seal, Basil demonstrates that the Holy Spirit seals believers to effect their sanctification and renewal. ‘In the first place He [the Spirit] was made an unction, and being inseparably present was with the very flesh of the Lord...’<sup>364</sup> Basil shows that the Holy Spirit is in like manner present in the flesh of believers, who, if they keep faith, attain to God’s grace. ‘They [believers], then, that were sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption, and preserve pure and undiminished the first fruits which they received of the Spirit, are they that shall hear the words “well done thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will

---

<sup>359</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:29. *PG* 32:153B-C.

<sup>360</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:36; *John* 6:63. *PG* 32:173A.

<sup>361</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:31; *Gal.* 4:6; *Psalms* 104:30. *PG* 32:157B. ‘Οικείωσις πρὸς Θεόν, διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος. «Ἐξαπέστειλε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, κρᾶζον· Ἀββᾶ ὁ Πατήρ.» Ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐξανάστασις, τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος. «Ἐξαποστελεῖς γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου, καὶ κτισθήσονται, καὶ ἀνακαινιεῖς τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς.»’

<sup>362</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:36; *John* 6:63. *PG* 32:173A.

<sup>363</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:31; *Gal.* 4:6; *Psalms* 104:30. *PG* 32:157B.

<sup>364</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:25. *PG* 32:140C. ‘Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ αὐτῇ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ Κυρίου συνῆν, χρῖσμα γενόμενον, καὶ ἀχωρίστως παρὸν’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

make thee ruler over many things (*Matt.* 25:21).”<sup>365</sup> Basil employs an illustration of light upon an image. Thus, by way of the illumination of the Holy Spirit, believers are enabled to perceive the ‘brightness of the glory of God’ (*Heb.* 1:3), and by way of the ‘Express Image’ believers are led up to God as the Source of the Express Image and Seal.<sup>366</sup>

To show that the Holy Spirit is unction and seal, Basil calls upon the Gospel of Matthew to link being ‘sealed’ with the hope of resurrection. Basil first establishes the Holy Spirit to be unction by virtue of His attested presence with the flesh of Jesus Christ (on *John* 1:33).<sup>367</sup> Then Basil extends this activity of the Holy Spirit to believers when he describes how the Holy Spirit seals them too so that they enter into the grace of the Lord (on *Matt.* 25:21).<sup>368</sup> By way of the illustration of light upon an image, Basil argues for the divinity of the Holy Spirit who enables believers to perceive the glory of God (on *Heb.* 1:3) and leads them to follow the Express Image and Seal to God, the Source.<sup>369</sup>

Basil draws from Scripture to support the principle that the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy. ‘The revelation of mysteries is indeed the peculiar function of the Spirit, as it is written, “God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit (1 *Cor.* 2:10).”’ This builds upon the point already argued that the Holy Spirit makes the

---

<sup>365</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:25; *Matt.* 25:21. *PG* 32:141B-C. ‘Οἱ τοίνυν σφραγισθέντες τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως, καὶ ἣν ἔλαβον ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκέραιον καὶ ἀμείωτον διασώσαντες, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσοντες. «Εὖ δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἤς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω.»’

<sup>366</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:40; *Heb.* 1:3. *PG* 32:185B-C. “Ὡς περ οὖν ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ προσκύνησιν λέγομεν, τὴν ὥς ἐν εἰκόνι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι, ὥς ἐν ἑαυτῷ δεικνύντι τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου θεότητα. Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ προσκυνήσει ἀχώριστον ἀπὸ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Ἐξω μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχων αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ προσκυνήσεις τὸ παράπαν· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ γενόμενος οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ ἀποχωρίσεις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· οὐ μᾶλλον γε, ἢ τῶν ὁρατῶν ἀποστήσεις τὸ φῶς. Ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἰδεῖν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, μὴ ἐν τῷ φωτισμῷ τοῦ Πνεύματος. Καὶ τὸν ἐνατενίζοντα τῇ εἰκόνι, ἀμήχανον τῆς εἰκόνος ἀποχωρίσαι τὸ φῶς. Τὸ γὰρ τοῦ ὁρᾶν αἴτιον, ἐξ ἀνάγκης συγκαθορᾶται τοῖς ὁρατοῖς. Ὡστε οἰκείως καὶ ἀκολουθῶς διὰ μὲν τοῦ φωτισμοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ καθορῶμεν· διὰ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος, ἐπὶ τὸν οὗ ἐστὶν ὁ χαρακτήρ καὶ ἡ ἰσότης σφραγὶς ἀναγόμεθα.”

<sup>367</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:25. *PG* 32:140C.

<sup>368</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:25; *Matt.* 25:21. *PG* 32:141B-C.

<sup>369</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:40; *Heb.* 1:3. *PG* 32:185B-C.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

‘royal Dignity’ apparent to believers and further proves the Spirit’s full divinity.

370

Building from the principle that the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy, Basil shows that the divinity of the Holy Spirit is attested in Scripture by God’s revealing mysteries to believers by His Spirit,<sup>371</sup> and, as noted above, in illuminating believers to perceive the ‘brightness of the glory of God’.<sup>372</sup>

Basil argues in support of the principle that the Holy Spirit gives gifts to the ‘worthy’. The Holy Spirit’s gifts, he says, are ‘communicated only to the worthy. ...Only then after a man is purified from the shame whose stain he took through his wickedness, and has come back again to his natural beauty, and as it were cleaning the Royal Image and restoring its ancient form, only thus is it possible for him to draw near to the Paraclete’<sup>373</sup> Basil shows that when believers have co-operated with the Holy Spirit in their quickening and sanctification the ‘Royal Image’ emerges. “‘He that soweth to the Spirit,” it is said, “shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting (*Gal. 6:8*).”<sup>374</sup>

In support of his principle that the Holy Spirit gives gifts to the ‘worthy’, Basil points up more divine activity of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit as the Paraclete<sup>375</sup> engages with the believer to prepare them to receive the gifts offered by God. Since, as Basil says, these gifts can only come to a believer who has become pure so that the Royal Image is completely restored and shines through,

---

<sup>370</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:24-25; 1 *Cor.* 2:10. *PG* 32:137C. ‘τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως τῶν μυστηρίων ἰδίως τῷ Πνεύματι προσηκούσης, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὅτι «Ἡμῖν ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος».

<sup>371</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:24-25; 1 *Cor.* 2:10. *PG* 32:137C.

<sup>372</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:40; *Matthew* 11:22. *PG* 32:185B-C.

<sup>373</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:15. *PG* 32:109A-B. Ἀπόροιστον τῇ φύσει· χωρητὸν δι’ ἀγαθότητα πάντα μὲν πληροῦν τῇ δυνάμει, μόνοις δὲ ὃν μεθεκτὸν τοῖς ἀξίοις, οὐχ ἐνὶ μέτρῳ μετεχόμενον, ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως διαιροῦν τὴν ἐνέργειαν. ... Καθαρθέντα δὴ οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵσχους ὁ ἀνεμάξατο διὰ τῆς κακίας, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐκ φύσεως κάλλος ἐπανελθόντα, καὶ οἷον εἰκόνι βασιλικῇ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μορφήν διὰ καθαρότητος ἀποδόντα, οὕτως ἐστὶ μόνως προσεγγίσει τῷ Παρακλήτῳ.

<sup>374</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:6-7; *Gal.* 6:8. *PG* 32:84A-B «Ὁ γὰρ σπείρων, φησὶν, εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.»

<sup>375</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:15. *PG* 32:109A-B.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the Holy Spirit is clearly doing the work of God in seeing to it that the believer is engaged, purified and gifted with eternal life.<sup>376</sup>

Building from the principle of the Holy Spirit's divine nature, Basil provides support for the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'For the first principle of existing things is One, creating through the Son and perfecting through the Spirit.'<sup>377</sup> 'For if our Lord, when enjoining the baptism of salvation, charged his disciples to baptize all nations in the name "of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," (on *Matt.* 28:19) ...The Lord has delivered to us a necessary and saving doctrine that the Holy Spirit is to be ranked with the Father.'<sup>378</sup>

Basil describes how the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead: the Holy Spirit perfects that which the Father creates through the Son.<sup>379</sup>

What use of ideas in common can be traced in these arguments of Basil with those of other colleagues, especially Athanasius of Alexandria and Apolinarius of Laodicea?

Basil of Caesarea emerged as a participant in the Christological discussions in the early 360s, later than Apolinarius had done. Basil's earliest influence probably came from Athanasius, and then influence from Apolinarius followed. It was not until Basil contemplated the writing of his *Contra Eunomium* in the early 360s that he actively sought advice from Apolinarius. Basil extended his efforts into Pneumatology in the 370s and after he had become Bishop of Caesarea. In this later period he began to distance himself from Apolinarius and his views especially about the Incarnation. In his *De Spiritu Sancto* Basil carried forward arguments in Pneumatology that were based upon some of the principles that Athanasius had established a decade earlier in the *Epistulae ad Serapionem*.

---

<sup>376</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:6-7; *Gal.* 6:8. *PG* 32:84A-B.

<sup>377</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:23. *PG* 32:136B. 'Ἀρχὴ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων μία, δι' Υἱοῦ δημιουργοῦσα, καὶ τελειοῦσα ἐν Πνεύματι.'

<sup>378</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:16; *Matt.* 28:19. *PG* 32:84B. '«Τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν, ἐκ Πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου.»'

<sup>379</sup> Basil, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:23. *PG* 32:136B.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Why did Basil of Caesarea in his *De Spiritu Sancto* invoke the authority of post-apostolic witnesses to the ‘unwritten’ traditions of the Church?

In *De Spiritu Sancto*, Basil sets the value of unwritten teaching as evidence in his opening argument in chapter 27.

Of the beliefs and practices whether generally accepted or publicly enjoined which are preserved in the Church some we possess derived from written teaching; others we have received delivered to us “in a mystery” by the tradition of the apostles; and both of these in relation to true religion have the same force...For were we to attempt to reject such customs as have no written authority, on the ground that the importance they possess is small, we should unintentionally injure the Gospel in its very vitals; or, rather should make our public definition a mere phrase and nothing more.<sup>380</sup>

Basil reminds his audience that what has come down to the fourth-century Church “in a mystery”, that is, the received doxologies and liturgical formulae of the Church, were inspired by Scripture and lead to the supposition that both *dogma* and *kerygma* are valid and important responses to the Gospel. In Basil’s view both written tradition and liturgical praxis have equal authority.

Basil’s argument seeks to establish the view of the Holy Spirit as a Person of the Trinity in the mind of the Church by appealing to the authority from both Scripture and the ‘tradition of the apostles’ in the doxologies and liturgical formulae. The success of Basil’s argument from unwritten tradition is due in appreciable extent to the common recognition amongst his audience that the early Church presupposed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Even the opponents to this view recognised that they were part of a tradition that revered the Holy Spirit.

The effort to define a doctrine of the Holy Spirit consistent with Nicene theology embroiled the Church in a decade of debate and politics. Basil could not find all

---

<sup>380</sup> Basil, *DSS XXVII*; *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:40-41. *PG* 32:188A-B. ‘Τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ παρεδεξάμεθα· ὅπερ ἀμφοτέρω τὴν αὐτὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν. ... Εἰ γὰρ ἐπιχειρήσῃμεν τὰ ἄγραφα τῶν ἐθνῶν ὡς μὴ μεγάλην ἔχοντα τὴν δύναμιν παραιτεῖσθαι, λάθοιμεν ἂν εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ καίρια ζημιοῦντες τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· μᾶλλον δὲ εἰς ὄνομα ψιλὸν περιστῶντες τὸ κήρυγμα.’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the authoritative evidence he sought in Scripture alone, so he turned to ‘unwritten’ teaching in the Apologists, forerunners and liturgical practices, especially in the sacraments of baptism, anointing and Eucharist.<sup>381</sup> Finally, there was the difficulty of comprehending and describing the divine being of the Holy Spirit. Since the Holy Spirit’s mission in the Church began in the time of the Apostles, the Church had only recent and fleeting experience with the third Person of the Trinity.<sup>382</sup>

Basil’s effort to develop a convincing argument for the Holy Spirit’s full divinity and worthiness of worship demanded more authoritative support and examples than he could find in Scripture alone. Basil faced a diverse audience that included conservatives who tried to discount proofs that did not derive clearly and directly from Scripture. Basil had to present his evidence from unwritten teaching in a compelling manner, which could not be so readily dismissed. Hence, he appealed to the sacraments, in which celebrants invoke the Holy Spirit in a variety of ways and over the first three centuries of the Church, providing a chain of examples that even the conservatives could not dismiss so hastily if they valued the sacraments.

At this point, it is worth determining whether Basil drew upon earlier texts in his composition of *De Spiritu Sancto*. Hübner suggests that Basil made use of earlier texts, such as Basil’s own *Contra Eunomium III* and *Homilia XXIV*, and, possibly, Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos*, in the following sections of *De Spiritu Sancto VI* and *XVIII* (Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 264-268). As above with Athanasius, this enquiry follows Hübner’s route of access into the texts of Basil, Athanasius, Pseudo-Athanasius, and Apolinarius to view the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit expressed amongst these writers *and* in reply to their opponents. To accomplish this purpose, this study will:

---

<sup>381</sup> Basil, *DSS XXIX*; *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:45-47. *PG* 32:200-208.

<sup>382</sup> According to G. L. Prestige, ‘Another reason for backwardness in asserting that the Holy Spirit was God is to be found in the necessarily more subjective method of approaching the subject of His personality. Christ had appeared on earth and had made history; but the Holy Spirit was now dwelling in Christian hearts and now making history. The character of his operation as present and eternal required time and distance to be achieved before it could present an equally objective appearance to consciousness.’ G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*. (1936/2008), 80-81.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

- (1) Search the key works, identified by Hübner for content on the development of the doctrine on the divinity of the Holy Spirit;
- (2) Compare these works with others in which ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit are discussed; and
- (3) Place these works and the pneumatological content they express in their historical and theological contexts.

Hübner specifically calls out instances in Basil's *DSS* chapters *VI* and *XVIII* where he thinks ideas are borrowed from Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos*.<sup>383</sup> Hübner's findings that bear directly upon the possible use in common of ideas between Basil and Pseudo-Athanasius can be examined in the following passages from *DSS VI* and *XVIII*:

Basil's *DSS VI*...

But in time no one is so devoid of sense as to assert that the Maker of the ages holds a second place, when no interval intervenes in the natural conjunction of the Father with the Son. And indeed so far as our conception of human relations goes, it is impossible to think of the Son as being later than the Father, not only from the fact that the Father and Son are mutually conceived of in accordance with the relationship subsisting between them, but because posteriority in time is predicated of subjects separated by a less interval from the present, and priority of subjects farther off. For instance, what happened in Noah's time is prior to what happened to the men of Sodom, inasmuch as Noah is more remote from our own day; and, again, the events of the history of the men of Sodom are posterior, because they seem in a sense to approach nearer to our own day. But, in addition to its being a breach of true religion, is it not really the extremest folly to measure the existence of the life which transcends all time and all the ages by its distance from the present? Is it not as though God the Father could be compared with, and be made superior to, God the Son, who exists before the ages, precisely in the same way in which things liable to beginning and corruption are described as prior to one another? (*PG 32:88C-89B*)<sup>384</sup>

---

<sup>383</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 264-268.

<sup>384</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 14:5f. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:8. *PG 32:88C-89B*. 'Ἀλλὰ χρόνος μὲν, οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀνόητος ὥς δευτερεύειν λέγειν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν αἰώνων, οὐδενὸς διαστήματος μεσιτεύοντος τῇ φυσικῇ πρὸς

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Take away from me, any notions of place or time when you consider questions of God, the Word, and of the Holy Spirit. Take away separations in locale, and do not believe that the Father is in a different place to give away his Son to another place, when he generates him. For lies of this kind are impious reasonings, for about the substance of the Son you are in scandalous offense. In company with the Son is the Holy Spirit, being before all time from the only Father of all. (*PG* 28:112D)<sup>385</sup>

Basil's *DSS VI*...

The superior remoteness of the Father is really inconceivable, in that thought and intelligence are wholly impotent to go beyond the generation of the Lord; and St. John has admirably confined the conception within circumscribed boundaries by two words, 'In the beginning was the Word.' For thought cannot travel outside 'was', nor imagination beyond 'beginning'. Let your thought travel ever so far backward, you cannot get beyond the 'was', and however you may strain and strive to see what is beyond the Son, you will find it impossible to get further than the 'beginning'. True religion, therefore, thus teaches us to think of the Son together with the Father. (*DSS VI* 14:5f. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:8-9) (*PG* 32:89A-B)<sup>386</sup>

---

τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Υἱοῦ συναφεῖα. Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὔτε τῇ ἐννοίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων συμβαίνει νεώτερον λέγειν τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν Υἱόν, οὐ μόνον τῷ σὺν ἀλλήλοις νοεῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνα λέγεται τῷ χρόνῳ δεύτερα, ὅσα τὴν πρὸς τὸ νῦν ἀπόστασιν ἐλάττωνα ἔχει· καὶ πάλιν ἐκεῖνα πρότερα, ὅσα περισσότερον ἀπέχει τοῦ νῦν. Οἷον πρότερα τῶν Σοδομιτῶν, τὰ κατὰ Νῶε, ὅτι τοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ πλέον ἀπόκισται· καὶ ὕστερα ταῦτα ἐκείνων, ὅτι μᾶλλον πῶς δοκεῖ προσεγγίζειν τῷ νῦν. Τῆς δὲ πάντα χρόνον καὶ πάντας αἰῶνας ὑπερεχούσης ζωῆς τῇ πρὸς τὸ νῦν ἀποστάσει τὸ εἶναι καταμετρεῖν, πῶς οὐχὶ πρὸς τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ ἐστὶ καὶ πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν ἀνοίας ἔχει· εἴπερ καθ' ὃν τρόπον τὰ ἐν γενέσει καὶ φθορᾷ πρότερα εἶναι ἀλλήλων λέγεται, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ Θεῷ τῷ ὑπάρχοντι πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων παραμετρούμενος ὑπερέχει;

<sup>385</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.*, *PG* 28:112D. "Ἀνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄνελε τοπικούς χωρισμούς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννᾶν ὑποπεύσης. Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ ψευδεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἄθεοι λογισμοί, περὶ τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σε σκανδαλίζουσι. Συνεξήρνηται δὲ σοι μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, διὰ τοῦ ὕψ' ἐνὸς προκατέχεσθαι πάντα τοῦ Πατρὸς."

<sup>386</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 14:5f. *PG* 32:89A-B. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω ὑπεροχὴ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀθεώρητος, τῷ ἀπαξιαπλῶς μῆτε ἐνθύμησιν μῆτε τινὰ ἔννοιαν τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου γέννησιν ὑπεραίρειν, καλῶς τοῦ Ἰωάννου διὰ δύο φωνῶν εἶσω περιγράφτων ὅρων τὴν διάνοιαν ἀποκλείσαντος, ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν· «Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος.» Ἀνέκβατον μὲν γὰρ διανοίαις τὸ ἦν· ἀνυπέρβατον δὲ φαντασίαις ἀρχή. Ὅσον γὰρ ἂν ἀναδράμῃς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄνω, οὐκ ἐκβαίνεις τὸ ἦν. Καὶ ὅσον ἂν διαταθῇς ἰδεῖν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὰ ἐπέκεινα, ὑπεράνω γενέσθαι τῆς οὐ δυνήσης. Εὐσεβὲς οὖν κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἅμα νοεῖν τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρί·

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

### Basil's *Hom. XXIV*

There is, indeed, the Father, having a perfect being Himself, not needing any one else, the root and fountain of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. There is also the Son full of the [Father's] divinity, the living Word, and the offspring of the Father. Nay, he is full of the Spirit, not a part of the other, but is considered perfect and entire in Himself. He is, indeed, joined to the Father together inseparably, joined to the Son is the Spirit. Thus, there is nothing that invalidates that conjunction into eternity. For no age intervenes between them, nor can any think of the separation of mind, so much so that the Only-begotten will always be with the Father, the Holy Spirit has eternal being with the Son. (*PG* 31:609B)<sup>387</sup>

### Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

But the Father who is of course perfect, who has a perfect essence, is the root and source of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: and He is in the full divinity of the Son, the living Word, and the offspring of the Father without need. He is also in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit to the Son, not a part of the other, but in Himself integral. And after this, the Trinity, which in fact exists, without any separation in time. (*PG* 28:116B)<sup>388</sup>

### Basil's *DSS VI...*

If they really conceive of a kind of degradation of the Son in relation to the Father, as though He were in a lower place, so that the Father sits above, and the Son is thrust off to the next seat below, let them confess what they mean. We shall have no more to say. A plain statement of the view will at once expose its absurdity. They who refuse to allow that the Father pervades all things do not so much as maintain the logical sequence of thought in their argument. The faith of the sound is that God fills all things; but they who divide their up

---

<sup>387</sup> Basil, *Hom. XXIV. PG* 31:609B. Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ, τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνεκδέξ, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει θεότητι ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνεκδέξ· πλήρης δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλὰ τέλειον καὶ ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεωρούμενον. Καὶ συνῆπται μὲν ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ ἀδιαστάτως· συνῆπται δὲ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα. Τὸ γὰρ διορίζον οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ τὸ διατέμνον τὴν ἐξ αἰδίου συνάφειαν. Αἰὼν γὰρ οὐδεὶς μεταξὺ παρεμπίπτει· οὐδὲ μὴν δέχεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπίνοιαν χωρισμοῦ, ὥς ἡ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς μὴ συνόντος αἰεὶ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μὴ συνυπάρχοντος τῷ Υἱῷ.

<sup>388</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.*, *PG* 28:116B. Ἄλλ' ἔστι μὲν ὁ Πατήρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνεκδέξ, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει τῇ θεότητι, ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνεκδέξ· πλήρης δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ Τριάς, ἀληθινῶς οὕσα, συνῆπται μὲν ἀδιαστάτως·

and down between the Father and the Son do not remember even the word of the Prophet: 'If I climb up into heaven thou art there; if I go down to hell thou art there also.' (*Psalms* 139:8) Now, to omit all proof of the ignorance of those who predicate place of incorporeal things, what excuse can be found for their attack upon Scripture, shameless as their antagonism is, in the passages 'Sit thou on my right hand' (*Psalms* 110:1) and 'Sat down on the right hand of the majesty of God'? (*Heb.* 1:3) The expression 'right hand' does not, as they contend, indicate the lower place, but equality of relation; it is not understood physically, in which case there might be something sinister about God, but Scripture puts before us the magnificence of the dignity of the Son by the use of dignified language indicating the seat of honour. It is left then for our opponents to allege that this expression signifies inferiority of rank. (*DSS VI* 15:1-31. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:9) (*PG* 32:89B-92A)<sup>389</sup>

Let them learn that 'Christ is the power of God and wisdom of God,' (1 *Cor.* 1:24) and that 'He is the image of the invisible God' (*Col.* 1:15) and 'brightness of his glory,' (*Heb.* 1:3) and that 'Him hath God the Father sealed,' (*John* 6:27) by engraving Himself on Him. Now are we to call these passages and others like them, throughout the whole of Holy Scripture, proofs of humiliation, or rather public proclamations of the majesty of the Only Begotten, and of the equality of His glory with the Father? We ask them to listen to the Lord Himself, distinctly setting forth the equal dignity of His glory with the Father, in His words, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the

---

<sup>389</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 15:1-31; *Psalms* 139:8; *Psalms* 110:1; *Heb.* 1:3. Pruche (1968), 290-292. *PG* 32:89B-92A. 'Εἰ δ' ὡς ἐν τόπῳ ὑποκειμένῳ ὑπόβασιν τινα τοῦ Υἱοῦ νοοῦσι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ὥστε ὑπεράνω μὲν τὸν Πατέρα καθῆσθαι, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἐφεξῆς εἰς τὸ κάτω τὸν Υἱὸν ἀπεῶσθαι, ὁμολογεῖτωσαν τοῦτο, καὶ ἡμεῖς σιωπήσομεν, τῆς ἐναργείας αὐτόθεν τὸ ἀπεμφαῖνον ἐχούσης. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ ἐν τοῖς λογισμοῖς ἀκόλουθον διασφύζουσιν οἱ διὰ πάντων διήκειν τῷ Πατρὶ μὴ διδόντες, τῆς τῶν ὑγιαίνοντων ἐννοίας τὰ πάντα τὸν Θεὸν πεπληρωκέναι πιστευούσης· οὐδὲ μέμνηνται τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· «Ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ· ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην, πάρει»· οἱ τὸ ἄνω καὶ κάτω εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν διαιροῦντες. Ἵνα δὲ τῆς ἀμαθείας τὸν ἔλεγχον σιωπήσω, τόπον ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων ἀφορίζοντων, τί τὴν πρὸς τὰς Γραφὰς μάχην καὶ ἐναντίωσιν αὐτῶν οὕτως ἀναίσχυντον οὖσαν παραμυθήσεται, τό· «Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου», καὶ τό· «Ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ»; Τὸ γὰρ δεξιὸν οὐ τὴν κάτω χώραν δηλοῖ ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ἴσον σχέσιν· οὐσωματικῶς τοῦ δεξιοῦ λαμβανομένου οὕτω γὰρ ἂν τι καὶ σκαιὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶη, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν τιμίων τῆς προσεδρείας ὀνομάτων τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τῆς περὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τιμῆς παριστάντος τοῦ λόγου. Λειπόμενον τοίνυν, αὐτοὺς τὸ τῆς ἀξίας ὑποδεῆς διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης δηλοῦσθαι λέγειν. Μανθανέτωσαν τοίνυν ὅτι Χριστὸς «Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία», καὶ ὅτι «εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου», καὶ «ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης», καὶ ὅτι τοῦτον ὁ Πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ Θεός, ὅλον αὐτῷ ἑαυτὸν ἐντυπώσας. Ταύτας τοίνυν, καὶ ὅσαι ταύταις συγγενεῖς κατὰ πᾶσάν εἰσι τὴν Γραφὴν μαρτυρίαι, πότερον ταπεινωτικὰς εἶναι φαμεν, ἢ ὥσπερ τινὰς ἀναρρήσεις, τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τοῦ Μονογενοῦς καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἴσον τῆς δόξης ἀνακηρύττειν;



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Father;’ (*John* 14:9) and again, ‘When the Son cometh in the glory of his Father;’ (*Mark* 8:38) that they ‘should honour the Son even as they honour the Father;’ (*John* 5:23) and, ‘We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father;’ (*John* 1:14) and ‘the only begotten God which is in the bosom of the Father.’ (*John* 1:18) Of all these passages they take no account, and then assign to the Son the place set apart for His foes. A father’s bosom is a fit and becoming seat for a son, but the place of the footstool is for them that have to be forced to fall.

We have only touched cursorily on these proofs, because our object is to pass on to other points. You at your leisure can put together the items of the evidence, and then contemplate the height of the glory and the preeminence of the power of the Only Begotten. However, to the well-disposed hearer, even these are not insignificant, unless the terms ‘right hand’ and ‘bosom’ be accepted in a physical and derogatory sense, so as at once to circumscribe God in local limits, and invent form, mould, and bodily position, all of which are totally distinct from the idea of the absolute, the infinite, and the incorporeal. (*DSS VI* 15:32-50. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:9) (*PG* 32:92A-C)<sup>390</sup>

Basil’s *Hom. XXIV*...

Who is the splendour, and who the glory? The Apostle discerns ‘...and [the Son is] the imprint of [the Father’s] being’. (*Heb.* 1:3) They are the same, then, the hypostasis and the glory, and because of the splendour of the express image. So perfect, and with undiminished glory goes only perfect brightness. And this the image of the Word, divine endowment, the unity we show and the divinity. This, for in Him, they are the same. In this way, they are both united, being that they do not differ, the Son is not to be understood as

---

<sup>390</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 15:32-50; Pruche (1968), 292-294. *PG* 32:92A-C. 1 *Cor.* 1:24; *Col.* 1:15; *Heb.* 1:3; *John* 6:27; *John* 14:9; *Mark* 8:38; *John* 5:23; *John* 1:14,18. *PG* 32:92A-C. ‘Ἀκουέτωσαν δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου σαφῶς ὁμότιμον ἑαυτοῦ τὴν δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ παριστῶντος, ἐν τῷ λέγειν· «Ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμέ, ἑώρακε τὸν Πατέρα.» Καὶ ἄλλιν· «Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς.» Καὶ τό· «Ἵνα τιμῶσι τὸν Υἱὸν, καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν Πατέρα.» Καὶ τό· «Ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς Μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρός.» Καὶ τό· «Ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς.» Ὅν μὴδὲν ὑπολογισάμενοι, τὴν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἀφωρισμένην χώραν προστιθέασιν τῷ Υἱῷ. Κόλπος μὲν γὰρ πατρικός, Υἱῷ καθέδρα πρέπουσα· ἡ δὲ τοῦ ὑποποδίου χώρα, τοῖς ἐπιδεομένοις τῆς ὑποπτώσεως. Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ἐφ’ ἑτέρα τὴν ὁρμὴν ἔχοντες, παρατρεχόντως τῶν μαρτυριῶν ἐφηγάμεθα· ἔξεστι δὲ σοι κατὰ σχολὴν συναγαγόντι τὰς ἀποδείξεις, τὸ τῆς δόξης ὕψος καὶ τὸ τῆς δυνάμεως ὑπερέχον τοῦ Μονογενοῦς κατιδεῖν. Καίτοι εὐγνώμονι ἀκροατῇ οὐδὲ ταῦτα μικρά· εἰ μὴ τις σαρκικῶς καὶ ταπεινῶς ἐξακούει τοῦ δεξιοῦ καὶ τοῦ κόλπου, ὥστε τόπῳ τε τὸν Θεὸν περιγράφειν καὶ ἀναπλάττειν σχῆμα καὶ τύπον καὶ θέσιν σωματικὴν, ἢ παρὰ πολὺ τῆς ἐννοίας τοῦ ἀπλοῦ καὶ ἀπείρου καὶ ἀσωμάτου διώρισται· πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι τὸ τῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοῦ ταπεινόν, ἐπὶ τε Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ παραπλήσιον.’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

second according to another species and extraneous imprint. (*PG* 31:608B)<sup>391</sup>

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell*....

‘...I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.’ (*John* 10:36-38)  
Therefore, the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, this is nothing other, than He who is born of God had to be the Son of God, and is God according to nature, as it is revealed, and in Himself to present the Father's form, the very one in the substance of the Father shown to all. (*PG* 28:109B)<sup>392</sup>

Basil's *DSS XVIII*...

So that according to the distinction of Persons, both are one and one, and according to the community of Nature, one. How, then, if one and one, are there not two Gods? Because we speak of a king and of the king's image, and not of two kings. The majesty is not cloven in two, nor the glory divided. The sovereignty and authority over us is one, and so the doxology ascribed by us is not plural but one; because the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype. Now what in the one case the image is by reason of imitation, that in the other case the Son is by nature; and as in works of art the likeness is dependent on the form, so in the case of the divine and uncompounded nature the union consists in the communion of the Godhead. One, moreover, is the Holy Spirit, and we speak of Him singly, conjoined as He is to the one Father through the one Son, and through Himself completing the adorable and blessed Trinity. Of Him the intimate relationship to the Father and the Son is sufficiently declared by the fact of His not being ranked in the plurality of the creation, but being spoken of singly; for he is not one of many, but One. For as there is one Father and one Son, so is there one Holy Spirit. He is consequently as far removed from created Nature as reason requires the singular to be removed from compound and plural bodies; and He is in such wise united to

---

<sup>391</sup> Basil, *Hom. XXIV*; *Heb.* 1:3. *PG* 31:608B. ‘Τί δὲ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, καὶ τίς ἡ δόξα; Αὐτὸς εὐθὺς ἡρμήνευσεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἐπάγων· Καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως. Ταυτὸν οὖν ἐστὶ τῇ δόξῃ μὲν ἡ ὑπόστασις, τῷ ἀπαυγασματι δὲ ὁ χαρακτήρ. Ὡστε, τελείας μενούσης καὶ μηδὲν μειουμένης τῆς δόξης, τέλειον πρόεισι τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. Καὶ οὕτως ὁ τῆς εἰκόνος λόγος, θεοπρεπῶς παραδεχθεὶς, τὴν ἐνότητα ἡμῖν παρίστησι τῆς θεότητος. Οὗτος γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῳ, κάκεινος ἐν τούτῳ. Ὅτι καὶ οὗτος τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, οἷος ἐκεῖνος· κάκεινος, οἷος οὗτος.’

<sup>392</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell*; *John* 10:36-38. *PG* 28:109B. ‘ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί.» Οὐκοῦν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν εἶναι, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ, τοῦτό ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον, τὸν Υἱὸν εἶναι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγεννημένον, Θεὸν ὄντα κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, ὅπερ ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ δεικνύντα τὸ πατρῷον εἶδος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ δεικνύμενον ἐπὶ τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως.’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the Father and to the Son as unit has affinity with unit. (*DSS XVIII* 45:13f. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:28) (*PG* 32:149C)<sup>393</sup>

We do not fritter away the theology in a divided plurality, because one Form, so to say, united in the invariableness of the Godhead, is beheld in God the Father, and in God the Only begotten. For the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; since such as is the latter, such is the former, and such as is the former, such is the latter; and herein is the Unity. (*DSS XVIII* 45:8-11. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:28) (*PG* 32:149B)<sup>394</sup>

Basil's *Hom. XXIV*.

Therefore, when we [contemplate how] the Trinity joins together, my mind does not imagine a union of three different parts (for this is impious reasoning), but understands three perfect incorporeal [Persons] in a union of essence. For where there is the presence of the Holy Spirit there also shall Christ make Himself present, but when Christ is present then there of course the Father is present. 'Do you not know that your bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit who dwells in you?' (1 *Cor.* 3:16) And, 'If a man profanes the temple of God, him will God destroy.' (1 *Cor.* 3:17) For this reason, when by the Spirit we are sanctified, we receive Christ in our inner person to

---

<sup>393</sup> Basil, *DSS XVIII* 45:13f. Pruche (1968), 406. *PG* 32:149C. 'Ὡστε κατὰ μὲν τὴν ιδιότητα τῶν προσώπων, εἷς καὶ εἷς· κατὰ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως, ἐν οἷ ἀμφοτέροι. Πῶς οὖν, εἴπερ εἷς καὶ εἷς, οὐχὶ δύο θεοί; Ὅτι βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκὼν, καὶ οὐ δύο βασιλεῖς. Οὐτε γὰρ τὸ κράτος σχίζεται, οὐτε ἡ δόξα διαμερίζεται. Ὡς γὰρ ἡ κρατοῦσα ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία, οὕτω καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν δοξολογία μία, καὶ οὐ πολλαί· διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνης τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει. Ὁ οὖν ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα μιμητικῶς ἡ εἰκὼν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖ φυσικῶς ὁ Υἱός. Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνικῶν κατὰ τὴν μορφήν ἡ ὁμοίωσις, οὕτως ἐπὶ τῆς θείας καὶ ἀσυνθέτου φύσεως, ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς θεότητός ἐστιν ἡ ἔνωσις. Ἐν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ αὐτὸ μοναδικῶς ἐξαγγελ λόμενον, δι' ἐνὸς Υἱοῦ τῷ ἐνὶ Πατρὶ ὑναπτόμενον, καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ συμπληροῦν τὴν πολυύμνητον καὶ μακαρίαν Τριάδα· οὗ τὴν πρὸς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν οἰκείωσιν ἱκανῶς ἐμφαίνει τὸ μὴ ἐν τῷ πλήθει τῆς κτίσεως τετάχθαι, ἀλλὰ μοναχῶς ἐκφωνεῖσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῶν πολλῶν ἐστιν· ἀλλ' ἐν ἐστὶν. Ὡς γὰρ εἷς Πατὴρ καὶ εἷς Υἱός, οὕτω καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Τῆς μὲν οὖν κτιστῆς φύσεως τοσοῦτον ἀποκεχώρηκεν, ὅσον εἰκὸς τὸ μοναδικὸν τῶν συστηματικῶν καὶ πληθυσμὸν ἐχόντων. Πατρὶ δὲ καὶ Υἱῷ κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἥνωται, καθόσον ἔχει μονὰς πρὸς μονάδα τὴν οἰκειότητα.'

<sup>394</sup> Basil, *DSS XVIII* 45:8-11. Pruche (1968), 406. *PG* 32:149B. 'εἰς πλῆθος ἀπεσχισμένον τὴν θεολογίαν μὴ σκεδανύνοντες· διὰ τὸ μίαν ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Θεῷ Μονογενεῖ τὴν οἶον μορφήν θεωρεῖσθαι, τῷ ἀπαραλλάκτῳ τῆς θεότητος ἐνεικονιζομένην. Υἱὸς γὰρ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ Πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ· ἐπειδὴ καὶ οὗτος τοιοῦτος, οἷος ἐκεῖνος, κάκεῖνος οἷοςπερ οὗτος· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ ἓν.'

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

dwell, and together with Christ the Father abiding in common with the worthy. (*PG* 31:609C-D)<sup>395</sup>

Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*

Do not, therefore, as it were, think that we imagine three undivided members in the body. For such a thought is impious, the possessions of others from the perfect incorporeal. We admit undivided coexistence of those who are into each other, without any distance, and when the three are in fact in existence- we understand one form, which begins from the Father, shines forth in the Son, and is manifested by the Holy Spirit. For this reason, they say of the Spirit that Christ, too, bears witness for Him, for Paul says, 'If any one does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His;' and 'but if Christ be in you, though the body indeed is dead because of sin,' (*Rom.* 8:9,10) and so on. And John says: 'From this we recognize that Christ is in us, by the Spirit which He has given us.' (1 *John* 4:13) And, indeed, our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit, Paul calls Christ, moreover, to be in us when he says: But when Christ, dwells in our inner person, as it is written, it is God who dwells in us, for, 'Do you not know,' he says, 'that you are God's temple, and the Spirit of God dwells in you.' (1 *Cor.* 3:16) (*PG* 28:116C-D)<sup>396</sup>

The possible use in common of ideas between Basil and Pseudo-Athanasius are examined in the passages given above from *DSS VI* and *XVIII*. The ideas on the Holy Spirit that Basil presents in *DSS VI* have clear connections with those of

---

<sup>395</sup> Basil, *Hom.* XXIV; 1 *Cor.* 3:16,17. *PG* 31:609C-D. "Όταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαίρετου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμός), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Όπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ πάρεστι δηλονότι. Οὐκ οἶδατε, ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐστὶ; Καὶ, Εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός. Ἀγιαζόμενοι οὖν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, δεχόμεθα τὸν Χριστὸν κατοικοῦντα ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν Πατέρα, κοινὴν ποιούμενον τὴν μονὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις.

<sup>396</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.*; *Rom.* 8:9,10; 1 *John* 4:13; 1 *Cor.* 3:16. *PG* 28:116C-D. 'Μὴ τοίνυν ὡς ἐνσώματα ἀδιαίρετα μέρη φανταζώμεθα τρία. Δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμός, ἀλλότριος ἀσωμάτων τελείων. Ἀδιαίρετον δεχώμεθα συνουσίαν συνόντων ἀλλήλοις ἀδιαστάτως, καὶ τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑφεστώτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα φοροῦντες φοροῦσι Χριστόν· «Εἰ γάρ τις,» φησὶ, «Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης· «Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκουμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.» Καὶ ναὸν μὲν ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ὁ Παῦλος ὀνομάζει, Χριστὸν δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι λέγει. Χριστοῦ δὲ οἰκοῦντος εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Θεός ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν· «Οὐκ οἶδατε, γὰρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.»'

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

earlier texts, notably Ps-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.* and Basil's *Hom. XXIV*. As discussed above in this study (see *infra* chapter 2) *Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos* is difficult to date, but considering the technical level of the principles and supporting ideas on the nature of the Holy Spirit, it is probably best to place it in time after *Contra Eunomium – Liber Tertius* and before *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos*, that is, between the years 364 and 375.<sup>397</sup> Basil challenges the view of opponents to a Son consubstantial with the Father that the relationship between the Son and Father can be described in material and earthly terms that ascribe order in time. Basil informs his opponents that their view cannot be applied to God 'who exists before the ages'.<sup>398</sup> This idea Basil uses in common with Ps-Athanasius, who makes a similar plea in *C. Sabell.* against the view of his opponents that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit can be described in terms of place or time. Ps.-Athanasius counters on the basis that God is 'before all time'.<sup>399</sup> Basil continues in *DSS VI* with the idea that one must think of the Son always being together with the Father. Basil draws from *John* 1:1 to illustrate the limits of how one may conceive of the generation of the Lord – the *beginning* and *was* are beyond human ken.<sup>400</sup> In *Hom. XXIV*, Basil extends the idea of the Son's eternal being with the Father, who Himself has 'perfect' being and is the 'fountain' of the Son and Holy Spirit, to include the eternal being of the Holy Spirit with the Son.<sup>401</sup> This idea connects with Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*, where he too describes the Father as 'perfect' and 'source' of the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and finally the Trinity which exists truly and beyond any temporal separation.<sup>402</sup> Basil then argues in *DSS VI* against any spatial notions the opponents present to distinguish the Father, Son and Spirit. He counters their use of *Psalms* 110:1 and *Heb.* 1:3 to support their view of a diminished rank for the Son with his interpretation that these passages really

---

<sup>397</sup> Paul Jonathan Fedwick, *A Chronology of Basil*. In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. Ed. Paul Jonathan Fedwick, 3-19. Fedwick's proposed dates for Basil's three major works on the Holy Spirit are followed in this study with the exception of '*Omilia KA: Kata Sabellianon, kai Ariou, kai ton Anomoion (Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos)*', which on the basis of the technical level of its principles and supporting ideas arguably can be placed between the years 364 to 375.

<sup>398</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 14:5f. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:8. *PG* 32:88C-89B.

<sup>399</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.*, *PG* 28:112D.

<sup>400</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 14:5f. *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:8. *PG* 32:88C-89B.

<sup>401</sup> Basil, *Hom. XXIV*, *PG* 31:609B.

<sup>402</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.*, *PG* 28:116B.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

indicate places of honour to signify magnificent dignity.<sup>403</sup> Both Ps-Athanasius and Basil address the unity of substance in the Trinity. They employ the term *hypostasis* in relation to *Heb.* 1:3. Pseudo-Athanasius describes *he patrike hypostasis* (109B)<sup>404</sup> and Basil draws equivalent pairs *hypostasis* – *doxa* and *karakter* – *amaugasma*.<sup>405</sup>

The ideas on the Holy Spirit that Basil presents in *DSS XVIII* also connect with those of earlier texts, notably Ps-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.*, Basil's *Hom. XXIV*, and Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.*. Basil argues in *DSS XVIII* against the opposition's accusation that speaking of divine persons in the Trinity suggests the existence of more than one God. Basil demonstrates that the unity of God in the Trinity, and that which enables one to distinguish the Persons of the Trinity whilst holding to this unity of God, is best conceived of as 'communion in the Godhead'.<sup>406</sup> As with the Father and the Son, Basil declares, so with the Holy Spirit, Who is One conjoined with the Father through the Son and completes the Trinity.<sup>407</sup> This view of the unity of God in the Trinity as 'communion in the Godhead' appears in another way in Basil's *Hom. XXIV* where Basil describes the Trinity as 'three perfect incorporeal Persons in a union of essence'.<sup>408</sup> In Ps.-Athanasius' *C. Sabell.* the unity of the Trinity is presented slightly differently as the 'undivided coexistence' of three Persons in 'one form' that originates with the Father, shines forth in the Son and manifests in the Holy Spirit.<sup>409</sup> In Athanasius' *Epp. ad Serap.* (see *infra* chapter 3) Athanasius argues for the divinity of the Holy Spirit by tracing the Holy Spirit's divinity through the Son '...from our knowledge of the Son we may be able to have true knowledge of the Spirit.' The Holy Spirit is another Advocate [*Parakleton*], as is the Son. 'He [the Holy Spirit] is called Paraclete, Spirit of adoption, Spirit of sanctification, Spirit of God, and Spirit of Christ.'<sup>410</sup> The Holy Spirit's being is in the Godhead of the Trinity. '...the Son is

---

<sup>403</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 15:1-31. Pruche (1968), 290-292. *PG* 32:89B-92A.

<sup>404</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.* *PG* 28:109B.

<sup>405</sup> Basil, *DSS VI* 15:32-50 Pruche (1968), 292-294. *PG* 32:92A-C. See also Lienhard, "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison", (1986), 383.

<sup>406</sup> Basil, *DSS XVIII* 45:23. *PG* 32:149C 'κοινωνία τῆς θεότητός'.

<sup>407</sup> Basil, *DSS XVIII* 45:23. *PG* 32:149C.

<sup>408</sup> Basil, *Hom. XXIV*; 1 *Cor.* 3:16,17. *PG* 31:609C-D.

<sup>409</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.* *PG* 28:116C-D.

<sup>410</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:11; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 87.

called Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father is called Spirit of the Son. Thus the Godhead of the Holy Triad and faith therein is one.’<sup>411</sup> ‘The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.’<sup>412</sup> For Athanasius the Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*Ep. ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* 3.5).<sup>413</sup> Athanasius further supports the Holy Spirit’s full divinity when he presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. ‘This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one. ...that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from the one God. Him [the Holy Spirit] therefore who is no creature but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, who is glorified with the Father and the Son, who is confessed as God with the Word, who is active in the works which the Father works through the Son...’<sup>414</sup> is beyond the created order. Athanasius demonstrates on 2 *Cor.* 13:13, the Trinitarian (or Apostolic) benediction, that a fully divine Holy Spirit distributes the grace that the Father bestows through the Son on the faithful. ‘For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and lambent grace.’<sup>415</sup> For Marcellus, God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit who are *not* divided into different substances [*hypostases*] as he accuses Asterius of proposing.<sup>416</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:16; 103.

<sup>412</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>413</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>414</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ’ ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ’ ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡταὶ τῷ πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται.

<sup>415</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142.

<sup>416</sup> Marcellus frg. 47 in M. Vinzent, *Marcell von Ankyra*, (1997), 42. Frg. 66 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 197. ‘ἀδύνατον γὰρ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις οὕσας ἐνοῦσθαι μονάδι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἢ τριάς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ μονάδος ἔχει. ἐκεῖνα γὰρ ἀνακεφαλαιουῦσθαι ἔφησεν μονάδι ὁ ἱερὸς Παῦλος, ἃ μὴδὲν τῇ ἐνότητι τῷ θεῷ διαφέρει· ἐνότητι γὰρ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ θεῷ διαφέρει μόνα.’

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

From Marcellus of Ancyra, there is a clear assertion that both the Word and the Spirit have their being in one Godhead.<sup>417</sup>

Hübner argues that frequently one discerns in some chapters of Basil's book concerning Holy Spirit the thoughts and also words of the treatise *Contra Sabellianos* coming through, however, it is difficult in a detailed case to prove by a formal support or suggestion. The reason for it is the thorough literary processing. If however in a chapter several topics of the Apolinarius writing arise one behind the other, the degree of probability of a use by Basil increases. That applies for the first time to the 6th chapter. Basil turns there against a subordination of the Son. He speaks the already often-quoted thought that in the connection between Father and Son none mediates *diastema*. He brings *John* 1:1 to the proof and says (like already in the books *Contra Eunomium* and in *Homilia XVI*) that the two words 'beginning' and 'was' show the togetherness of Father and Son. He proceeds with the explanation that it is unreasonable to subordinate the Son to assume a lower (*hypobasis*) status, so that the Father would be above, the Son down. God fulfills everything. The argument however divides the Father and Son on the words 'above' and 'down'. Apart from the fact that it is ignorance to assign to the immaterial ones a place [in space and time], it betrays a contradiction in the interpretation of the Scripture verses: 'Set you to my right!' (*Psalms* 109:1) and: 'He sat down to the right of the majesty of God' (*Heb.* 1:3). 'Right side' does not mean the place down, as they say; the Word may not be physically (*somatikos*) understood; it indicates rather the greatness (*megaloprepes*) of the honour of the Son. That not His underlying rank (*axia*) thereby is stated, should be gleaned from *Col.* 1:15 and *Heb.* 1:3. God's image is impressed completely in the Son. These certifications are not meant to degrade, but to announce the greatness of the Son's being and the equality of His glory. These and other verses (*John* 14:9; *Mark* 8:38; *John* 5:23; 1:14,18) show 'height (*hypsos*) of the glory' and 'the superiority (*hyperekon*) of the being'. Words such

---

<sup>417</sup> Marcellus frg. 95 in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra*, (1997), 84. Frg. 55 in Marcellus, *Fragmente*, Klostermann and Hansen, (1972), 194. 'ἀλλ' ἔοικεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὁ πατὴρ εἶναι, κἂν Ἀστερίῳ μὴ δοκῇ καὶ τοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκείνῳ φρονοῦσιν. δοκεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο τῷ θεσπεσίῳ προφήτῃ Ἡσαΐα, τῷ δι' ἁγίου λέγοντι πνεύματος «καὶ προσκυνήσουσίν σοι, καὶ ἐν σοὶ προσεύξονται· ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν σοῦ. σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ θεός.» ὁρᾷς ὅπως πρόρριζον ἀνατρέπει τὴν τῶν ἐτεροδιδασκαλούντων ἔντεχνον κακουργίαν.'



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

as ‘right’ and ‘heart’ (*John* 1:18) one may not take as ‘carnal and earthly’ (*sarkikos kai tapeinos exakouoi*), with a view that does not describe (*topo... perigraphhein*) properly an infinite and immaterial God.<sup>418</sup>

Hübner reports that he has already treated what he sees as the close parallel in *De Spiritu Sancto XVIII* with *Contra Sabellianos* (108B-109C; 116B) for the most part with his discussion of their priority. For Hübner it is again the *eikon* theology of the treatise, which Basil takes up, this time together with the paradigm of the emperor and imperial picture, as he presents also in *Homilia XXIV*. Hübner sees the source for the treatise to be *Contra Sabellianos*, because he notes a likeness in the structure. In addition, for *De Spiritu Sancto XVIII* Hübner thinks the source is Pseudo-Athanasius (whom Hübner names as ‘Apolinarius’) in the treatise *Contra Sabellianos*, and not Basil’s own *Homilia XXIV*. That results among other things from Hübner’s following observations. Basil more avoided here the term *eidos*, which he did not remove in the treatise, and replaces it by its own formula ‘community of nature’. But he speaks, although with caution, of one ‘only form’ in Father and Son: We remain with the monarchy, ‘there in God, the Father, and God, the Only-begotten, to a certain extent (*oionei*) the one form (*morphen*) is to be given, which is reflected in the unchangedness of the Divinity because the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son (see *John* 14:10).’ But there is no parallel in *Homilia XXIV*, however, there probably is in *Contra Sabellianos* (116B). K. Holl also cited this argument. H. Dörries engaged the question as well. Basil very probably knows that he talked otherwise in the 8th chapter of the same book. Hübner suggests here an opposite to the Apolinarian statement, by granting only improper meaning to the term ‘form’: ‘Here the picture (image of the emperor) is in the way of imitation, which in the Son the image of God is there in a natural way. And as in the arts the similarity in the form exists, then the unity is with divine nature in the community of the Godhead.’ Hübner concedes to Basil that he has endeavored to avoid within *De Spiritu Sancto* an obvious contradiction of his statements. But correcting an argument that he did not introduce makes clear that he took over a train of thought from someone else. In his theological writing, Basil did not succeed in integrating Apolinarian conceptualness. The beginnings were too

---

<sup>418</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 264-268.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

different. That Basil tries it nevertheless again and again, says Hübner, shows his awareness of such ideas.<sup>419</sup>

Hübner reviews Dörries' argument that, due to the kinship in thought, structure and expression between Basil's *Homilia XXIV* and *De Spiritu Sancto XVIII*, the homily was available at the time of writing *DSS XVIII*, or it had served as a template for *DSS XVIII*. The second possibility, says Hübner, has just been ruled out by philological reasons. Toward the first J. Bernardi raised objection. It sets the sermon in too late a period. This was demonstrated by the contrast between the delicacy with which the *Homilia XV, De Fide*, describes the Holy Spirit, and the breadth of the discussion in *Homilia XXIV*. The death of Valens, or at least the easing of repression since 377 is probably the prerequisite for this different kind of public expression. This comes in a Trinitarian vocabulary. The term *hypostasis* appears no longer, however, the word *prosopon* occurs at least five times and the verb *ekporeuesthai* appears. In addition, Basil does not hesitate to speak publicly from the *homoousios*. Now, Hübner asserts, the frequent occurrence of the words *prosopon* and *homoousios* can be explained most simply by Basil's [possibly] having borrowed from the [Pseudo-Athanasian] treatise *Contra Sabellianos*. But openly public confession using *homoousios* and *ekporeuesthai* suggests to Hübner a time shortly before Basil's break with Eustathius of Sebaste in 373. The term *prosopon* is also used in *De Spiritu Sancto*, in two places significantly [Hübner, 269] under the influence of *Contra Sabellianos*. The statements about the Holy Spirit do not exceed those of *Homilia XV*. Both sermons are connected by strong parallels. The difference in shape has reasons that are still under discussion. Thus the ground for Bernardi's objections is withdrawn. The parallels that Dörries has found between *Homilia XXIV* and *De Spiritu Sancto*, are so specific that an approximately simultaneous writing is very likely indeed. But the parallels are - in contrast to what Dörries says - not limited to *DSS XVIII*. Thus there is the divinity (*Theion*) of the Spirit in the homily as well as in *DSS XIX* with I *Job* 33:4 and *Exodus* 31:3, with two written questions and the Incarnation (*Kristou epidemia*) with the unseparated presence of the Spirit. Similarly, are the statements about no separation between the persons of the Trinity and the common indwelling of the Spirit, the Son and the

---

<sup>419</sup> For this and what follows see Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 264-268.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Father...The scatter of the parallels between *Homilia XXIV* and *DSS XVIII*, Hübner claims, does not allow for a very tight bind. But undoubtedly the matches recognised here are numerous and specific. Hübner thinks this is due in large part to the use of *Contra Sabellianos* in both works.<sup>420</sup>

Not unimportant to Hübner are some more observations. Basil has used ideas in common in his *Homilia XXIV*, especially in the theology of his *Contra Eunomium III* dedicated to the Holy Spirit. The parallels concern invariably the last part of the homily, which has no connection with *Contra Sabellianos*. So there returns the consideration in *Contra Eunomium*, if we see by taking up 'the images of visible things' in us - which given the size of the objects was but difficult to conceive or whether we see by a force let us assume that detects the items - which had a view to the expansion of the universe and the smallness of our force are equally hard to imagine. He brings this example in both cases, in order to show that we may embrace the divinity of the Holy Spirit. And in both cases he wants to repel the same sophistic distinction.<sup>421</sup>

*Homily XXIV:6* - 'And do not bring me those clever words: "Before (time) either he (the Spirit) is unbegotten or begotten. If he is unbegotten, he is the Father; but if begotten, he is the Son; but if neither of them, he is a creature."'

*Contra Eunomium III:6* - 'And do not bring me back these cunning words: "If he is not a creature he is thus unbegotten (*gennema*) or begotten. But [if] he is neither unbegotten nor begotten of God. That leaves only to call him a creature and a work."'

On the relationship between the two texts, Hübner thinks, there can be no doubt. The same sophism of 'sycophant' also forms the background of the positive statements about the Spirit in *Epistula 125*, that is, the signed confession by Eustathius of Sebaste. There it is, the Holy Spirit is not unbegotten, because there is only a single nature; but the Spirit is uncreated from God.

With *Contra Eunomium* and at the same time with *De Spiritu Sancto XVIII*, the homily is connected by the verse of *Matthew* (12:31) on the unforgivable sin

---

<sup>420</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 268-271.

<sup>421</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 268-271.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

against the Spirit, and the highlighting of the uniqueness of the divine [Hübner, 271] persons, and especially of the mind. In this last point, however, the parallel between *Contra Eunomium* and *DSS XVIII* is stronger. Before the conclusions from these various data are drawn, they are still to complete.

Hübner sees that *Homilia XXIV* and *De Spiritu Sancto* are written in the same mood. The questions of many people on theological things, Basil complains in one chapter of *De Spiritu Sancto*, are nothing but traps and ambushes; they do not give them in order to gain something useful, but a seemingly just cause to have to battle if the answers do not match their expectations. Similarly, he tells his audience twice in *Homilia XXIV* that they only are there to criticize him, just watching his words to find something offensive. And he exhorts them, who want to make tests as judges instead of being receptive willing pupils, not to listen for something to their own taste, but only for what pleases the Lord, which is consistent with Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. In the final chapter of *De Spiritu Sancto* Basil characterizes the situation well, and there he named the two opposite fronts, against which he has to fight with the key words (inherited from *Contra Sabellianos*) of *Homilia XXIV*.<sup>422</sup>

Turning from Hübner to Drecoll now, Drecoll analyses Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* from a developmental viewpoint. [Drecoll, 249] The 'diastase' deity - creation had led Basil in *C. Eunom. III* 2:16-21 to what he has argued in *DSS XVI*. However, while in contrast the *C. Eunom. III* deity - creation abstract was taken as a contrast between *physis* and *metousia*, which was carrying in *DSS XVI* (see the section about the difference between angels and the Holy Spirit 38:61-99). Basil leads here a qualitative difference between *en* and *polla* and tries to describe with this difference, the doctrine of the Trinity. Drecoll observes that in the argument that refers to the sanctification by way of the Spirit Basil repeatedly tried to present this function as divine and therefore associated it with the *physis* of mental function. The *diastase* deity - creation is here conveyed by the connection of the mind with Father and Son as well as the contrast between unity and multiplicity. The background for this may be the discussion *en* and *polla* in Neo-Platonism [Drecoll, 250] for the doctrine of the Trinity, the problem

---

<sup>422</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 268-271.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

between the monotheistic concept of God and the Trinitarian structure of the Christian concept of God is discussed.<sup>423</sup> The relation of the Spirit to the Father and Son is described as *oikeiosis* and (45:27) *oikeiotes* (45:34) respectively; *oikeiosis* is about even between Christ or the Spirit in the salvation process, only with the reference to the *physis* is there actually a Trinitarian statement. So Basil is reluctant, Drecoll reports, as he does not name the Spirit as ‘God’. In the strict sense of the idea of *oikeiotes* between *monas* and *monas* is understandable only as an identity: there is only one *monas*, as well as just one thing, so it can be only an *en*. Basil is true in his argument with a view to preserving *monarxia* to somehow advance (by emphasizing the *monaxos/monadikos*), but *monas* and *monas* can still stand side by side, all the *eis kai eis kai en* in 44:20 accordingly. This avoids direct contradiction to the naming of the Trinity provoked immediately adjacent to the emphasis on the *en*. The *oikeiotes* of the Spirit as the relation of *monas* to *monas* is referred to by Basil on the common *physis*. Specifically, he explains here first the relationship between the Father and the Spirit (46:1-9), and then between Son and Spirit (46:10-36) before he attempts to integrate both in a third section in a uniform design (47:1-23). This detailed explanation of the intra-Trinitarian relations solves the problem with Basil’s plugged in argument: namely, the contrast that the triad is an *en* and yet consists of three *hypostaseis*, in turn, in each case as *eis* or [Drecoll, 251] *en* as a *monas* are identified and their *physis* somehow belongs together (*oikeiotes, koinonia*).<sup>424</sup>

Drecoll sees that the fact that between [mind] and Father is an *oikeiotes* (46:1f,7f) arises from the biblical language: the mind is *ek tou Theou* (1 Cor. 2:12) as a *pneumati stomatos auto* (Ps 32:6). It is clear [the Spirit is] from God (*proelthein*; see 46:20), but not *gennetos* as the Son (46:2-4). The way how he is exactly existent *arreton* (this ambiguity involves probably the *tropos tes hyparkeos*) remains unclear (46:8f). Basil transfers the Eusebian tradition that the begetting of the Son is indescribable to the mind. What is certain is that with *pneuma* not *stomatos* the Spirit part of the [*stoma*], so to speak, is an organ of God the Father, not a mere breath of wind (46:5). The [*stoma*], *Theoprepos* is to be understood (i.e., not physically, but spiritually towards God), in the Spirit it is

---

<sup>423</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 249-251.

<sup>424</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 249-251.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

an *ousia soma, agiasmou kyria*, so an independent existence. With this short formula Basil uses the two functions of spirit: gift of life and holiness, which he had developed in *DSS IX* and *XV*.<sup>425</sup>

The essential belonging to Christ (46:11f), says Drecoll, is also reflected in the biblical language. In addition to *Rom. 8.9 (pneuma Kristou)* (46:11f) shows the particularly *John 16:14* (cited in 46:13 and 46:29f), subject to *doxasein* is the Spirit (and that is what 46:12-30 while in the spirit 46:30-36 realm is the *doxasesthai*). From the physical splendour of the Son Basil distinguishes the *doxa* that is given someone *ek proaireseos* (46:20-22). The latter is again twice to understand (corresponding to the two parts of the sentence of 1.6), namely once as *doulike doxa*, that is shown for the creation of Christ, and once as *oikeiake doxa* that is due to the Spirit (46:23-26; cf. 46:13f). As thus Christ glorifying the Spirit is *pneuma tes aletheias* (*John 16:13*) and *pneuma sophias* (*Eph 1:17*), Christ is revealed as *e ou Theou dynamis* and *e tou Theou sophia* (*1 Cor. 1:24*) (46:15-17). The Spirit is subject to *doxasein* in *John 16:14* as Christ is subject to *doxasein* in *John 17:4* (46:21-30). Thus, there is a gradient from the Spirit of Christ and from Christ to God, which is foundational in 47:1-23.<sup>426</sup>

On 47:1-23, Drecoll observes, also referenced by the stressed *en eauto* (46:14f.17f, cf. *en to eautou megethei* 46:16f and *en to eautou axiomatic* 46:19), the Spirit is not simply third, but contains in itself the truth, and shows by his own *axioma* the *megalosyne* from which he is apparent (46:14f.17.19f). He can because he is not only subject from *doxasein*, but also the subject of *doxasesthai*. As according to *John 12:18b* the Son is glorified by the Father, so the Spirit is glorified. Basil describes *koinonia* [p. 252] of the Spirit with the Father and Son, and presents *Matt. 12:31*, which emphasizes the severity of the blasphemy against the Spirit. Also indicated is a gradient from the Father through the Son to the Spirit, which runs in reverse to that developed in 46:11-30.<sup>427</sup>

The existence of two counter-gradients are interpreted in Basil in 47:1-23. The emphasis is on the line from the Spirit through the Son to the Father. Our own

---

<sup>425</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 251-253.

<sup>426</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 249-251.

<sup>427</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 249-251.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

conception of the doctrine of the Trinity draws on the application of light on the pneumatological terminology from DSS IX. The light terminology has the advantage to express unity and diversity without close, adjacent ontological fixation. ‘Under the surface’ of light terminology are ontological statements. At the same time the light terminology connects deity and the human soul, which renders the deity of the Son and the Spirit undiminished.<sup>428</sup>

By *dynamis photistike* Christians fix their gaze on the beauty of the *eikon* (i.e., Christ) of God (*Col.* 1:15). Through this *dynamis photistike* Christians are led up (which corresponds to the Platonic enlightenment) to the beautiful sight of *arketypon* (47:1-4). In this path of knowledge, the spirit of knowledge is immediately present (47:4f). He does in fact give the *epoptike dynamis* for *eikon*, and not as a knowledge broker at a third level (not *dia* vgl.47:10, but *en eauto*, i.e., the presence of the Spirit in those who like to consider the truth leads to knowledge; 47:5-7). From this process the mind is not separable, it belongs to *akoristos* (47:4). The Spirit enables the realization, by himself; he is the quasi the medium, the *dynamis photistike*, reminiscent of the idea of *Contra Eunomium II* that in the absence of light no cognition is possible. This thought was brought forth in *John* 1:9 in relation to Christ. Christ appears here as *eikon* of the invisible God and the Spirit as the light that must be present at the perceiving. Consequently, Basil refers in addition to *Ps.* 35:10 also *John* 1:9 on the *photismos tou Pneumatos* (47:12-15). The *en Pneumati* is present also in *John* 4:24, which also contains the key statement *Pneuma o Theos* (*pneuma* is predicate noun, not subject) (47:10-12). Even on the basis of the quotation from *John* 4:24 Basil refers to the Spirit but not as God, the Spirit rather refers to the *doxa* of the Son and the gift of the knowledge of God (47:15-17).<sup>429</sup>

With the description of the Spirit of his role as *dynamis photistike* Basil arranges the Spirit in the relationship between Father and Son, which he had just set forth using the example of the king and the king’s statue, *prototypos* and *eikon*. Basil traces a line on which cognition takes place *enos apo tou enos Pneumatos dia Yiou epi ton ena Patera*, from the realm of the Spirit (*en eauto*) over the *doxa* of

---

<sup>428</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 249-251.

<sup>429</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 251-253.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the Son to the knowledge of God (47:15-19), recognized along this line but without gradation. Apart from the singular *anagein* it avoids the whole vocabulary for an Ascent: neither is set an above or below [Dreccoll, 253] ...all thoughts, in *Homily XV De Fide* and *DSS IX* still had their place, but in *DSS XVII*f is the rejection of subordination.<sup>430</sup>

According to Dreccoll, this also clearly shows the way how St. Basil uses the returning line. The movement *ek Patros dia tou Monogenous epi to Pneuma* namely means no gradation in terms of a decrease in deity, but just the identical disclosure: The *physike agathotes*, the *kata physin agiasmos* and the *Basilikon axioma* just go on from the Father through the Son in the Spirit. From the *physis* forth the Spirit, which is with the Father and the Son, is what is described in the image of the king and the king's statue: *to Basilikon axioma*. In 45:19-23 ...is transmitted from the image to the original image, has been interpreted in the same *Theotes*. The Spirit is with the Father and Son *Theotes*, ...as one of the three *hypostaseis* to *monarkia* (cf. 47:21-23).<sup>431</sup>

To Dreccoll, *DSS XVII*:f represents the centre of the argument of *DSS*. In *DSS V-VIII* Basil has tried to show that the Son in the *axia* standing next to the Father: The juxtaposition of Father and Son must not be resolved as subordination to preserve monotheism in the doctrine of the Trinity. The same applies to the Spirit. That the Spirit in general is one of Father and Son, shows through the *syntaxis* of *Matt.* 28:19 (taken in 44:7-12). In *DSS XVII* Basil begins from ranking the Father, Son and Spirit, but rejects a subordination. He paralleled the ratio Father - Son between the Son and Spirit, and the Spirit refers to the explanation of the relationship Father - Son, where the representation as *dynamis photistike* particularly allows the presence of the Spirit in the believer to connect mind with the unity of Father and Son. As for ontological terminology, Dreccoll concludes, Basil is very cautious. He refers back to the *hypostaseis* of the Homoiousian tradition and replaces that stressed previously with agreement in the *ousia* by recourse to the character of the *monas* as *en* unlike *polla*. He comes against Eustathius, but also maintains a position that was acceptable to Meletius.

---

<sup>430</sup> Dreccoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 251-253.

<sup>431</sup> Dreccoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 251-253.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Basil's *DSS* formed a theological basis of consensus for the entire Homoiousian spectrum. The Homoiousian background, which indeed was once strong with Basil, is especially even more evident in the reluctance of his Pneumatology.<sup>432</sup>

### ***Basil and post-apostolic witnesses***

How well did Basil's appeal to post-apostolic witnesses serve to carry his arguments?

In response to the objection that the doxology in which the invocation is 'with the Spirit' has no basis in written text, Basil anchors his counter point with the Apostle Paul's appeal to 'Hold fast the traditions which you have been taught...'<sup>433</sup> He then names his supporting witnesses: Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Rome, Dionysius of Rome, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Palestine, Origen, Julius Africanus and Gregory Thaumaturgus. Basil calls these witnesses to provide support for the answer that using 'with the Spirit' or 'and the Spirit' in the doxology rather than the opposition's prescribed 'in the Spirit' has precedent in early Church practice.<sup>434</sup> The opposition's insistence upon 'in the Spirit' is meant to lend support to their view of a Spirit subordinate to the Son.

For the purpose of this study, the writers before Nicaea are of interest to show that there was a presupposition in the early Church that the Holy Spirit is divine. These pre-Nicene writers include more than the ones whom Basil listed as witnesses. The testimony of witnesses who wrote before Nicaea, and who Basil names to provide evidence from 'unwritten' teaching for a divine Holy Spirit, begins with Irenaeus of Lyons. It is in *Adversus haereses* where Irenaeus describes the Holy Spirit as a gift in communion with Christ that God gives the Church for the enlivening and strengthening of believers.<sup>435</sup>

---

<sup>432</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 251-253.

<sup>433</sup> 1 Cor 11:2 and 2 Thess 2:15.

<sup>434</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:201B-C, 204A-D). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:45-47).

<sup>435</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*. (PG 7); G. L. Prestige places Irenaeus amongst the more literal followers of the Johannine tradition, 'This individualistic doctrine [whereby, according to Tatian, the devout soul acquires a connection with the Holy Spirit] is supplemented by Irenaeus (haer

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Basil continues the evidence for invoking the Holy Spirit with his witness Clement of Rome. Basil calls upon Clement, who describes the early Church as a community which the Holy Spirit actively guides and inspires.

So when Clement of Rome quotes the Book of Samuel, for instance (ad *Cor* 1.13.1), he writes, ‘the Holy Spirit saith,’ and this is typical of his attitude to Scripture. ...In like manner, according to Clement of Rome, the apostles went forth preaching the gospel with the fullness of Holy Spirit, and set aside the first-fruits of their converts as bishops and deacons after testing them by the Spirit (ad *Cor*. 1.42.4); and the directions which he himself gave to the rebellious Corinthians are similarly inspired: ‘be obedient to what we write to you through the Holy Spirit’ (ib 63.2).<sup>436</sup>

The testimony of Origen of Alexandria and Caesarea (in the Levant) makes its way into Basil’s argument in support of the use of the preposition ‘with’ when invoking the Holy Spirit in the doxology.

Origen, too, in many of his expositions of the *Psalms*, we find using the form of the doxology ‘with the Holy Spirit’. The opinions which he held concerning the Spirit were not always and everywhere sound; nevertheless in many passages even he himself reverently recognises the force of established usage, and expresses himself concerning the Spirit in terms consistent with true religion. ...And again, in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans ‘the holy powers,’ he says ‘are able to receive the Only-begotten, and the Godhead of the Holy Spirit.’<sup>437</sup>

The third-century historian Julius Africanus bears support for Basil’s argument in favour of phrasing the doxology ‘with the Holy Spirit’.

---

3.24.1), who writes that we receive our faith from the Church and preserve it; our faith renews itself through the Spirit of God, like a precious deposit in a fair vessel, and causes the vessel itself which contains it to be renewed. This gift of God has been entrusted to the Church, like the in-breathing into the first man, to the end that all the members may receive it and be quickened; and therein has been distributed the communion with Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the confirmation of our faith, the ladder of ascent to God. In the Church has God placed apostles, prophets, teachers, (cf. 1 *Cor* 7:28), and all the rest of the Spirit’s means of operation; where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace. Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 83.

<sup>436</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:201C, 204A). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:45-46).

<sup>437</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:204B-C). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:46).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Moreover, this form of the doxology was not unknown even to Africanus the historian. In the Fifth Book of his *Epitome of the Times* he says “we who know the weight of those terms, and are not ignorant of the grace of faith render thanks to the Father, who bestowed on us, His own creatures, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world and our Lord, to whom be glory and majesty with the Holy Spirit, for ever.” The rest of the passages may peradventure be viewed with suspicion; or may really have been altered...<sup>438</sup>

Basil then summons the testimony of the third-century spiritual mentor to his grandmother, Macrina the Elder, namely, Gregory Thaumaturgus.

Now one of the institutions of Gregory is the very form of the doxology to which objection is now made, preserved by the Church on the authority of his tradition; a statement which may be verified without much trouble by any one who likes to make a short journey. That our Firmilian held this belief is testified by the writings which he has left.<sup>439</sup>

To summarise the evidence from Basil’s witnesses for his use of ‘with the Holy Spirit’ along with ‘and the Holy Spirit’ as true to the traditions of the Church and ‘in accordance with holiness and true religion’, Basil concludes with a reference to Jesus’s commission to the disciples to baptise all the nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>440</sup>

But before the great tribunal what have I prepared to say in my defence? This; that I was in the first place led to the glory of the Holy Spirit by the honour conferred by the Lord in associating Him with Himself and with His Father at baptism; and secondly by the introduction of each of us to the knowledge of God by such an initiation...<sup>441</sup>

With this, Basil brings in a counterpoint to those opponents who neither acknowledge the Holy Spirit as God nor think the Spirit worthy of worship. In this they are consonant with the opinions of their colleagues, both conservative and neo-Arian. In light of Basil’s point about baptism and how it elevates the Holy Spirit, however, they find themselves outside the tradition and indeed out of

---

<sup>438</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:204C-D). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:46).

<sup>439</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:208A-B). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:47).

<sup>440</sup> Matt 28:19-20.

<sup>441</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:209A-B). Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:47-48).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

touch with the consensus of opinion that existed in the early Church that the Holy Spirit is indeed divine.<sup>442</sup>

What evidence from pre-Nicene authority can shed light on the liturgical practices of the early Church with reference to the Holy Spirit?

Not much text has been preserved from pre-Nicene times, yet what does exist bears compelling markers that the early Church largely regarded the Holy Spirit as divine. The early Church invoked the name of the Holy Spirit in baptism and in her hymns of praise.<sup>443</sup> As mentioned earlier, this study is focused in part on how the fourth-century Church regarded the Holy Spirit, Basil put forward prominent Christian writers as witnesses to his argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

### *Discussion of findings*

The modern scholars Reinhard M. Hübner and Volker H. Drecolll have made advances in analysing texts and tracing the connections of ideas and texts between Athanasius, Pseudo Athanasius, Apolinarius of Laodicea and Basil of Caesarea. The Hübner and Drecolll findings are applied in this study where they shed light on the possible flow of ideas amongst these writers in discussions of Pneumatology.

This discussion begins with Hübner's findings, which are summarised in the following. According to Hübner, one detects in some chapters of the book concerning the Holy Spirit the thoughts and also words of the treatise *Contra Sabellianos*, yet it is difficult to prove. The reason for this difficulty is the thorough literary processing. If however in a chapter several topics of the Apolinarius writing arise one behind the other, the degree of probability of a use by Basil increases. That applies for the first time to the 6th chapter. Basil turns there against a subordination of the Son. He speaks the already often-quoted thought that in the connection between Father and Son none mediates *diastema*. He brings *John* 1.1 to the proof and says (like already in the books *Contra Eunomium* and in *Homily* 16) that the two words 'it was' and 'beginning' show

---

<sup>442</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 152-155.

<sup>443</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 152-166.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the togetherness of Father and Son. He continues with the explanation that it is unreasonable to lower (*hypobasis*) the Son to assume a subordinate place, so that the Father would be above, the Son below. God fulfills everything. The argument however divides the Father and Son on the words ‘above’ and ‘down’. Apart from the fact that it is ignorance to assign to the immaterial ones a place, they contradict the statements of the writing: ‘Set you to my right!’ (*Psalms* 109:1) and: ‘He sat down to the right of the majesty of God’ (*Heb.* 1:3). ‘Right side’ does not mean the place down, as they say; the Word may not be physically (*somatikos*) understood; it indicates rather the greatness (*megaloprepes*) of the honour of the Son. That not His underlying rank (*axia*) thereby is stated should be learned from *Col.* 1:15 and *Heb.* 1:3. God is impressed completely in the Son. Such certifications are not demoting, but announce the greatness of the being and the equality of the glory. These and other words (*John* 14:9; *Mark* 8:38; *John* 5:23; 1:14,18) show ‘height (*hypsos*) of the glory’ and ‘the superiority (*hyperekon*) of the being’. Words as ‘right’ and ‘heart’ (*John* 1:18) one may not interpret as ‘carnal and earthly’ (*sarkikos kai tapeinos exakouoi*), an infinite and immaterial God is not so described (*topo... perigraphhein*).<sup>444</sup>

Such remarks in a discussion over the Holy Spirit seem unexpected, when Basil in this chapter writes against those who instruct that the Son ranks after the Father. A temporal interpretation of the succession, which repels Basil first, may appear still meaningful; but a spatial basis for subordination is wrong. Who of the Eustathians thought to attribute ‘above’ and ‘below’ to Father and Son? Basil forces the argument here a little by his polemic, which redirects the last chapter of the treatise *Contra Sabellianos* (120B-121B) against the earlier Sabellian opponents into an argument against the Pneumatomachi [Spirit fighters]. The original argument with the opponents was about God and Logos (in the case of the Incarnation): ‘If the Son is sent and descends, He is no longer with the One who sent Him and so is not with Who remains above!’ (120B). Some of the original wording of the argument is discernible. The idiom carries forward in certain words of the original argument [carnal and physical]. With Basil, Hübner found such phrasing only in *De Spiritu Sancto* and *Contra Eunomium*. For Apolinarius it is typical. *Mathetosan de to ano kai to en hypsei me somatikos*

---

<sup>444</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 264-265.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*akouein*..., he says here (120B). Hübner asserts that either the writing examples are not completely happily selected or the interpretation is not correct. The expression [height of the glory] is just as remarkable, which fits better into the context of this argument. Even in the style Basil seems to have adapted himself. He begins like Apolinarius in a sentence with *manthanethosan* and *akouetosan*.<sup>445</sup>

The 9th chapter of *De Spiritu Sancto* Hübner chooses to ignore, because of his view that *Contra Sabellianos* has much to do with it, in the Pneumatology of Apolinarius. Hübner concludes that Basil seems to have taken up here the thought and different writings of his former friend.<sup>446</sup>

Hübner says that the close parallel of *DSS XVIII* to *Contra Sabellianos* (108B-109C; 116B) was already treated in large part with the discussion of the priority. It is again the eikon theology of the treatise, which Basil takes up, this time together with the paradigm of the emperor and imperial picture, which he presents also in *Homilia XXIV*. The direct counterpart for the illustration is reliably *Contra Sabellianos*, because the arrangement is alike. In addition, for *DSS XVIII* it is drawn from that treatise, and not his own homily. Hübner finds that this results from the following observations. Basil more avoided here the term *eidos*, which he did not remove in the homily, and replaces it by his own formula 'community of nature'. But he speaks, although with caution, of one [only form] in Father and Son: We remain with the monarchy, 'there in God, the Father, and the Son, the Only-begotten, to a certain extent (*oionei*) the one form (*morphē*) is to be given, which is reflected in the unchangedness [of] the Divinity. Because the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son (see *John* 14:10).' But there is no parallel in *Homilia XXIV*, probably however in *Contra Sabellianos* (116B). K. Holl indicated also this place. H. Dörries has Basil in opposition, however he did not understand Holl's argument. Basil very probably knows that he talked otherwise and also differently still in the 8th chapter of the same book. He supplements also here particularly its already reduced statement opposite Apolinarius, by granting only improper meaning to the term 'form':

---

<sup>445</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 265-266.

<sup>446</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 266.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

‘Which here (image of the emperor) the picture is in the way of the imitation, that is there (image of God) naturally in the Son. And as in the arts the similarity in the form exists, then the One in the community of the Divinity. Hübner grants to Basil that he has somehow endeavored to avoid within *De Spiritu Sancto* an obvious contradiction of his statements, but accuses Basil of borrowing from the text and thought of Apolinarius.<sup>447</sup>

Hübner’s observations that there is text used in common between Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos* and Basil’s *De Spiritu Sancto* can be accepted with few reservations. This enquiry, however, finds that Apolinarian authorship for *Contra Sabellianos* remains unproven. Therefore, Hübner’s assertion that it is Apolinarius’ thought and writing that Basil is using in chapters 6 and 18 of *De Spiritu Sancto* makes two leaps beyond what this study can accept: 1) *Contra Sabellianos* rather than another document served as the source for text in *De Spiritu Sancto*; 2) Apolinarius rather than an unknown author (Pseudo-Athanasius) was the author of *Contra Sabellianos*.

This discussion now turns to Drecoll’s findings, which are summarised in the following. Drecoll identifies Basil’s diversion from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the ‘Eusebian – Origen’ tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit’s role in sanctification. To return to the discussion begun earlier in this study of Volker Henning Drecoll’s comments about the ideas that Basil presents on the Holy Spirit in *De Spiritu Sancto*, Drecoll questions the assertion that Basil’s authorship rests mainly on the fact that *pneuma* in *De Spiritu* is spoken of as God, either in 58f or 61. Interpreting the passage in *Psalms* 81:6 to be parallel with *agios* and *kaustikos* construed so as to attribute *Theos* is tenuous. Such use of *Theos* is found nowhere else in Basil’s discussion.<sup>448</sup> Basil describes the *pneuma* as *theios* or *theotes*, but never calls him *Theos*, as Gregory of Nyssa does. Basil at one point (*De Spiritu* 61) has *theos* but this is not especially significant if *De Spiritu* represents a study not intended for publication. Drecoll finds as a result of lexicographical analysis, that

---

<sup>447</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 266-267.

<sup>448</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 152-159.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the compiler of *De Spiritu* does not differ significantly in vocabulary from Basil.<sup>449</sup>

With the 'stilistische' analysis ruled out, since there are very few sections in which the text is not determined by the Plotinian text or Bible verses, what remains on the content analysis is to answer these two questions: Can dependency be found in certain Basilian writings in passages of *De Spiritu*? And are these passages then designed so that they can be rather closer to a common author as to the reception of the text of another, which connects to the question: Is it possible to fit *De Spiritu* into the development of the Basilian Trinity? Especially from *DSS* one can now give a series of parallels. First, there are quite external points of comparison, which still are of no decisive importance that indicate *DSS* already has a close proximity to St. Basil: The opposite *setein - euren* (*De Spiritu* 5f) can be found in *DSS* I, 1:8f, as a quote from *Luke* 11:10. That the compiler of *De Spiritu* knew the Letter of Origen to Gregory Thaumaturgus with the common reference points *ai theiai Graphai* makes a starting point, then *setein meta pisteos - euren* shows it is likely. The Letter of Origen to Gregory Thaumaturgus is included in the *Philokalia*, St. Basil has been identified in any case. *Psalms* 138:6 with the author stating 'David' (*De Spiritu* 7f) is also found in *C. Eunom.* I 12:11,13f.<sup>450</sup>

Most connections, however, go to *DSS* IX. At several points *DSS* IX *De Spiritu* is much closer than in *De Spiritu* processed in the text of Plotinus: This is especially true for the area in which the pneumatology of *DSS* IX transcends that of *C. Eunom.* III, namely, the broad perspective, the spirit is attributed, and which makes sense of the terminology of light. *De Spiritu* known as the theme to investigate the *physis* of the Spirit, proceeding from the Bible intellectually lead to the highest *physis*. What is actually executed are statements about the activities of the mind, the duality of sanctification and gift of life lead to a dual perspective: a) a comprehensive (*De Spiritu* 26: *panta pleroun ...*) grace in

---

<sup>449</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 152-159.

<sup>450</sup> *Ibid.*



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

sainthood, and b) that the saints are *azioi* (*De Spiritu* 16.30 and *DSS IX*, 22:26f.30f).<sup>451</sup>

The flow of ideas on the divinity of the Holy Spirit can be traced along distinct paths. The ideas that form Athanasius' Trinitarian principles applied to the Holy Spirit appear to varying extent in the Pneumatological writings of both Apolinarius and Basil. At this stage it appears evident that the prevailing direction in the flow of ideas was from Athanasius outward first to Apolinarius and later to Basil.

Basil draws from Scripture and tradition to show how the Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father. The key principles of Basil's understanding about the Holy Spirit are: (1) the Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father (2) the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son; (3) the Holy Spirit gives life; (4) the Holy Spirit is unction and seal; (5) the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy; (6) the Holy Spirit gives gifts to the 'worthy'; (7) the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>452</sup>

These ideas derive in large part from the key principles of Athanasius' understanding about the Holy Spirit, which are: (1) the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father; (2) the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son; (3) the Holy Spirit gives life; (4) the Holy Spirit is unction and seal; (5) the Holy Spirit inspires prophecy; (6) the Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son; (7) the Holy Spirit 'in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things' participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>453</sup>

---

<sup>451</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>452</sup> Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:36.

<sup>453</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. ad Serap.*, in Shapland, *Op. cit.* I.9, 23; 82, 127.

### ***Chapter 5: Re-assessing the Hübner/Drecolll-findings***

At the beginning of this study, it was shown that Hübner's argument for the use of ideas in common between Pseudo-Athanasius (and Apolinarius) and both Athanasius and Basil brought him to a scenario where there seemed to be clear instances of influence of Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius upon Basil and Athanasius. Drecolll challenged that scenario and argued for four others.<sup>454</sup>

Hübner's view of a movement of ideas from Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius outward assumes the primacy of their theological ideas over those of Basil and Athanasius. This assumed primacy is not compellingly supported in the examples he provides. Specifically, with *Epistulae 361-364* between Basil and Apolinarius, modern scholars may accept the authenticity of authorship but yet question the order of the letters.<sup>455</sup> Hübner makes a brief mention of these letters in support of his view that Basil borrowed the Trinitarian ideas of Apolinarius.<sup>456</sup>

Since *Epistulae 361-364* offer Hübner uncertain ground on which to base his argument, perhaps greater value can be gained for the purposes of this study from an adaptation of Hübner's approach with a shift in perspective. These letters call for a closer examination because they contain theological content that touches on the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit. A closer look at *Epistulae 361-364* yields significant theological content that supports the ideas of identity of substance in the Trinity and the divinity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>457</sup>

Shifting the perspective calls for moving the focus from the granular level of key phrases towards the identification of ideas. In the examination of *Epistulae 361-364*, it is beneficial to follow Hübner's guidance into the comparative analysis of the works, but to focus on two theological ideas of particular interest in this study which are discussed between Apolinarius and Basil: *identity of substance* in the Trinity and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>454</sup> Drecolll, *Die Entwicklung*, 35-36.

<sup>455</sup> Drecolll, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-28.

<sup>456</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 250-251.

<sup>457</sup> Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London, 1956).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In Basil's request to Apolinarius for clarification on the *homoousion* in *Epistula* 361, it is apparent that while Basil embraced unity of substance between the Father and the Son, he yet sought a more precise understanding. In Apolinarius' answer to Basil in *Epistula* 362, he defines unity of substance:

He [the Son] is of-one-substance [with the Father] in a quite exclusive and individual sense; not like members of the same species or bits partitioned from the same lump, but as the one and only offspring from the single stock and "pattern" of the deity, issuing in an inseparable and non-physical manner, in such wise that what begets continues to be its generative self [ιδιότης] while issuing as a begotten self.<sup>458</sup>

It is evident in this correspondence that Basil is traversing from the *homoiousion* view towards the *homoousion*. Robertson summarises Basil's route to the *homoousion* view this way:<sup>459</sup>

The Dated Creed, rejected with scorn at Ariminum, was unsuccessfully propounded in an altered form by Acacius in Seleucia. ...Not only did many of the Semi-Arians [Homoiousians] (e.g. the fifty-nine in 365) accept the *homoousion*, but it was from the ranks of the Semi-Arians that the men arose who led the cause of Nicaea to its ultimate victory in the East. There accompanied Basil of Ancyra from the Seleucian Synod to Constantinople a young deacon and ascetic, who read and welcomed the appeal of Athanasius. Writing a few months later, this young theologian, Basil of Caesarea, adopts the words of the *de Synodis*: 'one God we confess, one in nature not in number, for number belongs to the category of quantity, ...neither Like nor Unlike, for these terms belong to the category of quality ...He that is essentially God is Coessential with Him that is essentially God... If I am to state my own opinion, I accept "Like in essence" with the addition of "exactly" as identical in sense with "Coessential"...but "exactly like" [without "essence"] I suspect... Accordingly since "Coessential" is the term less open to abuse, on this ground I too adopt it'.

On the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Apolinarius tells Basil in *Epistula* 364 that 'The subject of the Spirit was introduced at the same time, to the effect that the

---

<sup>458</sup> Apolinarius, *Letter* 362, in Prestige, *Op. Cit.*, 43.

<sup>459</sup> Robertson, *Introduction to De Synodis*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:448; *Epp.* 8, 9, the Greek in Gwatkin, *Studies*, p. 242.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

fathers included him in the same confession as the Father and the Son, because he has his being in the same deity.<sup>460</sup>

Apolinarius placed the Holy Spirit within the Holy Trinity, albeit with a personal status subordinate to the Son.<sup>461</sup> Basil in his transition from the homoiousian to the homoousian view wrote in *Contra Eunomium III* that the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification is evidence of the Spirit's divinity.<sup>462</sup> Regarding Basil's Pneumatology, it is useful to turn back to Drecoll whose focus takes in these theological ideas. Drecoll recognises that Basil diverts from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification.<sup>463</sup> This study has already made note of how Basil challenged the Eunomian view of a difference in nature between the Father and the Son due to the Son's perceived emergence in time and creation, when he cited the numerous Bible attestations to God's being beyond time and creation and the Son's being the Word that was 'with God' and 'was God' (*John* 1:1) and to the Holy Spirit's possessing with the Father and the Son the same divine nature and engaging in the same deifying work—to sanctify, teach, and reveal truth—so that believers may drink of God's grace.<sup>464</sup>

In *Epistula* 364, Apolinarius tells Basil that bishops had visited on their way from a synod in Egypt bearing a letter in support of the Nicæan definition and critical of the *homoiousion*. Prestige identifies this letter as Athanasius' reply to Emperor Jovian's letter granting him reinstatement as Bishop of Alexandria. In his letter of reply, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, Athanasius defends orthodox doctrine on the Holy Spirit:<sup>465</sup>

---

<sup>460</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula* 364, in Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 45, note 5.

<sup>461</sup> Apolinarius, *Letter* 362, in G. L. Prestige, *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, (1956).

<sup>462</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D.

<sup>463</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 138-140.

<sup>464</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D. Milton V. Anastos, 'Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίου, A Critical Analysis', in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, *Op. cit.*, 67-136.

<sup>465</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula* 364, in Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 45, note 1. Athanasius, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4:567-568. Athanasius received a gracious letter of recall to his episcopal see at Alexandria [362?] from the Emperor Jovian. In his letter of reply, *Epistula LVI ad Jovianum*, Athanasius condemns those who deny the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

...But since now certain who wish to renew the Arian heresy ...[are] explaining away the 'Coessential,' and blaspheming of their own accord against the Holy Spirit, in affirming that It is a creature, and came into being as a thing made by the Son'.

...For they [the fathers of Nicaea] have not merely said that the Son is like the Father, ...but they wrote 'Coessential,' which was peculiar to a genuine and true Son, truly and naturally from the Father. Nor yet did they make the Holy Spirit alien from the Father and the Son, but rather glorified Him together with the Father and the Son, in the one faith of the Holy Triad, because there is in the Holy Triad also one Godhead.

Also in *Epistula* 364, Apolinarius criticizes the attempt on the part of the opponents to discredit the *homoousion* and replace it with 'similar in substance' saying, 'The motive is to suggest a substance that bears the same sort of similarity that a statue might bear to the Emperor.'<sup>466</sup> Interestingly, and as Prestige has cited, Apolinarius employs the same illustration of 'statue' and 'Emperor' that Athanasius uses in *Orationes contra Arianos*,<sup>467</sup> albeit in the opposite way. Apolinarius used the illustration of the statue and Emperor to show that the opponents to the *homoousion* present Christ as a *copy* of the Father. For Athanasius, the illustration of the image of the Emperor serves to show that 'Since the Son too is the Father's Image, it must necessarily be understood that the Godhead and propriety of the Father is [inherent in] the Being of the Son.'<sup>468</sup>

Hübner has charted a promising course through the late fourth-century writings on the Holy Spirit. He draws upon Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos*; Basil's *Homilia XXIV, Contra Eunomium III, Epistula 361*, and *De Spiritu Sancto*; Apolinarius' *Kata meros pistis* and *Epistula 362* and Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. He has chosen key phrases in texts as markers, which, in his analysis, describe their direction of flow and emergence in time. In the case of 'divine ousia' Hübner draws upon *Epistulae 361-364* to support his view that 'hypostasis' is used by Apolinarius first in the sense of 'divine ousia' (see *infra* chapter 1). For Apolinarius 'divine ousia' is uniquely the property of the

---

<sup>466</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula* 364, in Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 45, note 4.

<sup>467</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos III*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:396.

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Father.<sup>469</sup> Hübner has placed the emergence in time of Apolinarius' key phrase that describes the Son as 'brightness of His (God's) glory and extent of His hypostasis' on *Hebrews* 1:3 to a two-year period from the Synod of Constantinople in 360 to no later than 362, when the Trinitarian key phrase 'one ousia – three hypostases' came into use (described in Athanasius' letter *Tomus ad Antiochenos* written in 362).<sup>470</sup>

So Hübner's course across the writings of proponents on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit has provided a route worthy to be followed in this study. In pursuit of the flow of ideas about the nature and role of the Holy Spirit the texts Hübner has surveyed have provided the way towards this content. The approach that this study has taken to identify the markers for the flow of ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit diverges from that of Hübner on at least two dimensions. First, this study has drawn upon the writings of the opponents as well as those of the proponents of a divine Holy Spirit. Second, this study has shifted focus away from the granular level of phrases towards formal statements of key theological ideas as markers. Especially important to this study have been the two key theological ideas: *unity of substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit. A third dimension of this study is that it has sought descriptions of presuppositions amongst Christian writers before the fourth century to gain a sense of the mind of the Church concerning the nature and role of the Holy Spirit.

With this approach applied to the early writings of Pseudo-Athanasius, Apolinarius, Athanasius, Basil, and their opponents, this study has found that the initial tumult caused by the efforts of the Homoian semi-Arians at the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia in 358 to replace the statement of the 'homoousion' in the Nicene Creed with another creedal formula obscured a more subtle process that began with these opponents adding definition to statements on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit (see *infra* chapter 2). These opponents to the 'homoousion' had introduced formal descriptions drawn from Scripture of the Holy Spirit as 'Comforter' and 'Spirit of truth' (*John* 14:16-17, 15:26, 16:14). As

---

<sup>469</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237.

<sup>470</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237; *Hebrews* 1:3.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the debate intensified, the contenders represented this time by Eleusius of Cyzicus (of the Homoiousion party) drew upon Scripture by way of the baptismal commission (*Matt.* 28:29) describing the activity of the Holy Spirit to include ‘consolation, sanctification, and perfection’ (see *infra* chapter 2). Taken together, these early definitions put forward by those contending over the Nicene Creed presented the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, who participated in the Incarnation of the Son, Who as Son is the ‘image of the Divinity’ (see *infra* chapter 2). Amongst the pro-Nicene writers of the mid to late fourth century, Apolinarius of Laodicea included the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, with a status subordinate to the Son.<sup>471</sup>

Now this study resumes the discussion begun in Chapter 1 to further consider Apolinarius’ answer to Basil, *Ep.* 362 and whether or not the ideas surface in the two treatises: Basil’s *Homilia XXIV* and Pseudo-Athanasius’ *Contra Sabellianos*. For this, the enquiry turns to Hübner.

Hübner’s findings in *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* that bear directly upon the possible use of ideas in common between Basil of Caesarea, Apolinarius of Laodicea and Pseudo-Athanasius is summarized in these arguments, each taking a different view (see *infra* chapter 1). Note: The analysis comments of this study are inserted as ‘Comment:’.

### *Theology*

Pertaining to the dating of *Contra Sabellianos*:

1) Considering Photinus as the main opponent of *Contra Sabellianos*, Hübner proposes a date range of 351 to 352 CE;

Comment: This is a reasonable date range for a treatise against Photinus, as Photinus had made his views known by that period.

2) Regarding Apolinarius, the supposed author, he finds the years 358 to 363; and

---

<sup>471</sup> Apolinarius, *Epistula* 362, Presitge, *St Basil & Apollinaris*, 39-43.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Comment: This date range is not improbable but would be more likely if it spanned the years 358 to 361.

3) Thinking of Basil, the assumed reader, he reckons a date of *circa* 360.

Comment: This assumes that Basil had read the treatise *Contra Sabellianos* at what seems like the early date of 360. Basil's letter *Ep. 361* to Apolinarius reveals no awareness of the treatise *Contra Sabellianos*.

The Christology (in the early 360s) of Apolinarius is obviously already very developed, but the treatise does not yet entirely reveal the fixed Christological interest, different from Apolinarius' *Letter to the Emperor Jovian* dated from the year 363. In the sentence in *C. Sabellianos* 6 (108A): "...whoever says that there is an unbegotten (ageneton) God and another produced (genneton) God also teaches two gods because the difference of ousia which he introduces is blasphemous", can be an indication of the divisive controversy with Aetius or also Eunomius. The Trinitarian formula 'one ousia - three hypostases' is not met as such in *C. Sabellianos*, but the corresponding teaching of Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three persons in one ousia exists. The remarks in *C. Sabellianos* 7 (108C - 109A) on the eternal perfection of the Trinity, with which nothing could be summed created beings, such as the baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) proves, and which is beyond any "authority and power and dominion" (cf *Eph.* 1:21) – in which no angel had been counted, seems to reveal an awareness of the confrontation with the Tropici. The argument of Athanasius in the *Letters to Serapion* is also terminologically and factually similar. And *C. Sabellianos* 12 (116C - 117A) on the common dwelling and the uniqueness of the *energeia* of the Trinity, which Athanasius argued in the same letters, is best understood as an echo of the controversy over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. All this taken together places them to about the years 358-363.<sup>472</sup>

---

<sup>472</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 249-250. Hier sind in der Hauptsache nur die Schlußfolgerungen aus den Daten zu ziehen, die sich im Laufe der Untersuchungen ergeben haben. Die Zeit der Abfassung läßt sich von mehreren Ansatzpunkten her einkreisen.

1. Zunächst von Photin her gesehen. Seine Lehre hat sicher das Stadium der Entwicklung erreicht, das in den Texten von Sirmium (351) erkennbar ist. Da dort der anthropologische Vergleich der Trinität mit dem aus Geist, Seele, Leib zusammengesetzten Menschen noch nicht erwähnt wird, er aber doch so auffallend ist, daß man nicht verfehlt hätte, ihn anzuprangern, wenn Photin ihn von sich gegeben hätte, wird er ihn später entwickelt haben.

...2. Von Apolinarius her gesehen. Seine Christologie ist offensichtlich schon stark ausgeprägt; aber der Traktat zeigt noch nicht ausschließlich christologisches Interesse, wie es doch der fest



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Comment: In the above-quoted argument from Hübner, the key facts he presents – (1) an argument against the doctrine of Aëtius or Eunomius (108A), an answer directed towards the Tropici (108C - 109A), and an argument from the unique *energeia* of the Trinity for the divinity of the Holy Spirit (116C - 117A) – support his proposed date range of 358–363 for the writing of *Contra Sabellianos*.

Hübner supposes that Basil has the tract *C. Sabellianos* at least while in the course of writing his books *Contra Eunomium*, or about 360–364, but not before his request to Apolinarius [for a clarification of *homoousion*, which means same in substance] in the letter identified as *Ep. 361*. And to Hübner, it is not improbable that Apolinarius has sent along with his written response [*Ep. 362*] also the little treatise *Contra Sabellianos*. That he has sent an old work to Basil is not credible. So we reach the date 360.<sup>473</sup>

Comment: This is where the uncertainty over the order of the letters casts this scenario in a dubious light. There is no conclusive evidence to establish when Basil sent *Ep. 363*.<sup>474</sup> If *Ep. 361* does not give an indication that Basil has seen *Contra Sabellianos* and *Ep. 363* cannot serve as a source of evidence for his being aware of the treatise then Hübner's scenario finds little support here.

---

datierbare Brief des Apolinarius an Kaiser Jovian aus dem Jahre 363 schon verrät. In dem Satz *c. Sabellianos* 6 (108A): "... wer sagt, daß es einen unerzeugten (agenneton) Gott gebe, und einen anderen erzeugten (genneton) Gott, auch der lehrt zwei Götter aufgrund des Unterschieds der ousia, den er blasphemisch einführt", kann man einen Hinweis auf die ausgebrochene Kontroverse mit Aëtius oder auch Eunomius erblicken. Die trinitarische Formel 'eine ousia – drei Hypostasen' begegnet als solche nicht, aber die sachlich entsprechende Lehre von Vater, Sohn und heiligem Geist als drei Personen in einer ousia ist vorhanden. Die Ausführungen *c. Sabellianos* 7 (108C – 109A) über die ewige Vollkommenheit der Trias, mit der nichts Geschöpfliches zusammengezählt werden könne, wie das der Taufbefehl (Mt 28,19) beweise, in dem "kein Prinzip, kein Gewalt, kein Kraft" (vgl Eph 1,21) – also kein Engel – mitgezählt worden sei, scheint Kenntnis der Auseinandersetzung mit den Tropikern zu verraten. Die Argumentation des Athanasius in den Serapionsbriefen ist sachlich und auch terminologisch ähnlich. Auch *c. Sabellianos* 12 (116C – 117A) über die gemeinsame Einwohnung und die Einzigkeit der *energeia* der Trias, die von Athanasius in denselben Briefen wiederholt beschworen werden, ist am ehesten als Widerhall des Streites um die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes zu verstehen. Das alles zusammengenommen läßt auf die Jahre zwischen 358 und 363 schließen.

<sup>473</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 250-251.

<sup>474</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-28.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

According to Hübner, at the point where Basil's *Against Eunomius II* seems to use the tract of Apolinarius, and precisely in the interpretation of *John* 1:1 is an allusion to the Christology of Photinus: "Not by Mary, he says (John), is the beginning, and not from the time, but what (does he say)? 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' The existence since eternity, without suffering the begetting of the father... He conceived together in these few words..." <sup>475</sup>

Comment: For the purpose of his scenario, Hübner names Apolinarius as the author of *Contra Sabellianos*. Hübner's point that in *Against Eunomius II* Basil alludes to the Christology of Photinus is perhaps speculative. At the time Basil wrote *Contra Eunomium II* (ca 363), concerns about Marcellians had given way to abhorrence of the anhomioian (dissimilarian) doctrine of Eunomius of Cyzicus.

Hübner continues to describe his scenario. So apparently Basil knows exactly who is the 'Samosatener' of the treatise, for he is in the first sentence of the quotation, which has no literal counterpart to recognize in the treatise. Basil shows no particular interest in the Christological question, rather he turns the argument against Eunomius. Now the attention of Basil for Christological problems at no time is excessive, so this slight hint made here unfortunately cannot close a dispute with Photinus that had already been settled some time. It remains at about 360 as the *terminus ante quem* for the authorship of Apolinarius. To date it more precisely is not yet possible. If Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* IV and Basil's *Contra Eunomium* IV and V actually are works of Apolinarius, the date of composition perhaps will be narrowed closer. Hübner concludes this argument with the statement that for now one can just say that *Contra Sabellianos* probably was written in the years 358–360.<sup>476</sup>

Comment: When Hübner describes Basil's argument to be directed against the doctrine of Photinus (rather than Marcellus), it perhaps helps him to support both the dating and a connection between the content of Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* and Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV*. It is difficult to see a clear

---

<sup>475</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 250-251.

<sup>476</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 250-251.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

connection in this part of the discussion with Hübner's assertion that Apolinarius authored *Contra Sabellianos*.

Hübner presents the centrepiece of his thesis where he compares Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* with Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV, Contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomoeos*.<sup>477</sup> He presents his comparison of these two fourth-century treatises on pro-Nicene theology in seven proofs comprised of six parallel examples with a seventh example that calls out possible anomalies in wording [see *infra* chapter 1]. Note: The analysis comments of this study are inserted as 'Comment:'. Hübner's six parallel examples show the following:

1) Text in Pseudo-Athanasius appears in Basil;

Comment: Hübner's opening premise that there is content used in common in Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* and Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia XXIV* is verifiable in a comparative reading of these treatises and can be readily demonstrated in a parallel analysis of phrases from each. This is precisely what Hübner does to establish his premise. At both the textual and idea levels, there is appreciable content on the Holy Spirit that is used in common in both treatises. In the synopses of these treatises given above in this chapter, there is clear correspondence in the following ideas concerning the nature and role of the Holy Spirit: (1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity;<sup>478</sup> (2) The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three perfect incorporeal essences;<sup>479</sup> (3)

---

<sup>477</sup> Hübner, *Op. cit.*, 47-125.

<sup>478</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:100D-101A. "Όταν οὖν περὶ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ, «Ἐγώ,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς, «Ἐκεῖνος,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, «ἄλλος,» πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία, ' Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:605A. "Εὰν γὰρ ἀπέλθω, φησὶ, παρακαλέσω τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον πέμψει Παράκλητον ὑμῖν. Οὐκοῦν Υἱὸς μὲν ὁ παρακαλῶν, Πατὴρ δὲ ὁ παρακαλούμενος, Παράκλητος δὲ ὁ ἀποστελλόμενος.'

<sup>479</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:112D. "Ανελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἀνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννᾶν ὑποπεύσης.' Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609D. "Όταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαρέτου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμός), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Όπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστός, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἀρεστὶ δηλονότι. Οὐκ οἶδατε, ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐστὶ; Καὶ, Εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός. Ἀγιαζόμενοι οὖν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, δεχόμεθα τὸν Χριστὸν κατοικοῦντα ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν Πατέρα, κοινὴν ποιούμενον τὴν μονὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἀξίοις.'

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

The Trinity includes the Father, Son and Holy Spirit;<sup>480</sup> (4) He [the Father] is the root and fountain of the Son and of the Holy Spirit;<sup>481</sup> and (5) When by the Spirit we are sanctified, we receive Christ in our inner person, to dwell, and together with Christ, the Father abiding...<sup>482</sup>

2) Where they use text in common, Basil's use of the text does not appear to follow as logically as it does in Pseudo-Athanasius;

Comment: What appears to Hübner as a lag in logic, where Basil is seen as falling behind Pseudo-Athanasius, could be characterised as a divergence in logic meant to address a later controversy and audience. Basil specifically calls out the 'Pneumatomachi' as opponents in his argument.<sup>483</sup>

---

<sup>480</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116A. "Όταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέηται πλείονων τόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τόποις διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱὸν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτω· ὅτι μηδὲ ἔστι τόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστω."

Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:612A. "Οὕτε γὰρ ἡ Τριάς μένει Τριάς, ὑφαιρουμένου τοῦ Πνεύματος. Καὶ εἰ ἔν τι πάλιν ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως προσαφθείη, πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συνεισελεύσεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ συναρίθμησιν. Τί γὰρ κωλύει λέγειν· Πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν; Εἰ γὰρ εὐσεβὲς τὸ πιστεύειν εἰς μέρος τῆς κτίσεως, πολλῷ δήπου σεμνότερον τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν εἰς τὴν ὁμολογίαν παραλαμβάνειν."

<sup>481</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116A-B. Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609A. "Ἀλλὰ τί φαμεν; Ὅτι τὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεῖον ἐντεῦθεν ἐμφαίνεται, οὐχὶ προσώπων σύγχυσις. Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ, τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνενδεές, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει θεότητι ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνενδεές· πλήρης δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλὰ τέλειον καὶ ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεωρούμενον. Καὶ συνῆπται μὲν ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ ἀδιαστάτως· συνῆπται δὲ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα. Τὸ γὰρ διορίζον οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ τὸ διατέμνον τὴν ἐξᾱδίου συνάφειαν. Αἰὼν γὰρ οὐδεὶς μεταξὺ παρεμπίπτει· οὐδὲ μὴν δέχεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπίνοιαν χωρισμοῦ, ὥς ἢ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς μὴ συνόντος ἀεὶ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μὴ συνυπάρχοντος τῷ Υἱῷ."

<sup>482</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28: 117A. "συντιθείς. Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὴ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609C. "Όταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαιρέτου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβὴς γὰρ ὁ λογισμός), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Ὅπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ πάρεστι δηλονότι."

<sup>483</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:613C.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

3) In Pseudo-Athanasius, the use of text in common seems more complete and internally consistent than it does in Basil;

Comment: Basil's divergence in logic to address a later controversy and audience would call for a different treatment of text used in common.

4) In the example of the parallel exegesis of certain passages from the *Gospel of John* [notably *John* 14.16-18], Pseudo-Athanasius seems to argue more to the point than does Basil;

Comment: The exegeses of passages from Scripture would also call for a treatment in keeping with the demands of the controversy and the character of the audience. Basil argues against the 'Pneumatomachi' for the divinity of the Holy Spirit and makes effective use of *John* 4:24 and *Romans* 8:9-10 to describe the sanctifying role of the indwelling Holy Spirit.

5) In the use of Trinitarian terminology, thoughts and arguments a dependency is suspected but not obviously evident of Basil upon Pseudo-Athanasius; and...

Comment: Considering a comparison of texts and ideas on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit, Basil's use of Trinitarian terminology, thoughts and arguments align with those of Pseudo-Athanasius, with the exception of 608C-*fin*, where he argues against the 'Pneumatomachi'. Basil (from 608C onwards) employs Trinitarian terms in arguments that are structured specifically to assert the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit. For example when addressing the 'Pneumatomachi', Basil avoids using the term *dyas* (which Pseudo-Athanasius used frequently). Basil uses *synapheia* (609B-D) uniquely to describe how the Holy Spirit is a Person of the Trinity with the Father and the Son.<sup>484</sup>

6) These observations of Hübner, taken together with Basil's apparent tentativeness in arguing for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, speaks for the priority of Pseudo-Athanasius' text over that of Basil.

---

<sup>484</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609B-D.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Comment: Basil's apparent tentativeness in arguing for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit does not speak for the priority of Pseudo-Athanasius' text over that of Basil. This finding too lacks conclusive support from a comparison of texts and ideas on the Holy Spirit. Basil describes the Holy Spirit as existing in the fellowship (κοινωνίαν)<sup>485</sup> of the Godhead, which he argues positively (by including the Holy Spirit). By contrast, Pseudo-Athanasius presented the negative argument that the fellowship of the Godhead excludes created beings. As such, this does not set Basil's text at a priority second to that of Pseudo-Athanasius.

Hübner's seventh example shows anomalies in Basil's wording, especially in Basil's unexpected use of the term *genemma*, which offended him when Eunomius employed it to support neo-Arian arguments.<sup>486</sup>

Comment: Comparative anomalies in Basil's wording, especially in Basil's unexpected use of the term *gennema*, which offended him when Eunomius employed it to support neo-Arian arguments,<sup>487</sup> is a finding that is apparently supported by a comparison of the texts up to the point (609C) where Basil turns his argument to the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Basil uses *gennema* in this instance to show that the Son bears the perfect image of the Father. Basil then extends this perfect image, by way of the Holy Spirit, to the 'worthy': 'When by the Spirit we are sanctified,' Basil says, 'we receive Christ in our inner person to dwell, and together with Christ, the Father abiding in common with the worthy.'<sup>488</sup>

### ***Drecol's counter-argument***

On the correspondence between Basil and Apolinarius, Drecol accepts the genuineness of *Epistulae 361-364*. He explains that the correspondence between

---

<sup>485</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:616D.

<sup>486</sup> Hübner, *Ibid.*

<sup>487</sup> Hübner, *Ibid.* Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:608A. Διότι γεννητῶς ὑπάρχων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ φυσικῶς ἐκτυπῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς μὲν εἰκὼν, τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχει, ὡς δὲ γέννημα, τὸ ὁμοούσιον διασώζει.

<sup>488</sup> Basil, *Op. cit.*, PG 31:609C. Ὅταν οὖν ποτε συνάψωμεν τὴν Τριάδα, μὴ ὡς ἐνὸς πράγματος ἀδιαίρετου μέρη φαντάζου τὰ τρία (δυσσεβῆς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς), ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἀσωμάτων τελείων ἀχώριστον δέχου τὴν συνουσίαν. Ὅπου γὰρ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παρουσία, ἐκεῖ καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ πάρεστι δηλονότι.

Basil and Apolinarius is covered in very few manuscripts. The authenticity has been widely recognized in the investigations of Prestige and Riedmatten. Since the Trinitarian doctrine of Apolinarius for the period 360 (apart from *Epistulae* 362 and 364) is not well known, the case must be good for the authenticity above all of *Epistula* 361. That *Epistula* 361 represents the position of Basil seems likely, especially compared with his *Epistula* 9. The expectant position in both letters clearly can also bring *Contra Eunomium* into relationship so that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of *Epistulae* 361-364 due to internal criteria. Basil had to face the mid-seventies occupied with the accusation of Eustathians that he had maintained contact with the heresiarch Apolinarius, based on the existence of this correspondence. To find that *Epistula* 361 belongs to Basil, taken with the fact that *Epistulae* 362 and 364 belong to Apolinarius; so *Epistula* 363 should then also be true, however, produces little for the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>489</sup>

Drecol's findings in *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilii von Cäsarea* that bear directly upon the possible use of ideas in common between Basil of Caesarea and Pseudo-Athanasius will be summarized in the following [see *infra* chapter 1]. Note: The analysis comments of this study are inserted as 'Comment:'.

### *Drecol's objection to Hübner's assertion*

Drecol begins by pointing out that Hübner is focused from the outset on only one of several [five alternative] possibilities to explain how Basil's and Pseudo-Athanasius' texts can be related. Instead of considering Basil's possible dependence on Apolinarius, Drecol looks at these alternatives:<sup>490</sup>

---

<sup>489</sup> Drecol, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-22. It should be noted here that Drecol's comment on Hübner's use of *Epistulae* 361-364, while serving a critical purpose, passes over significant theological content, especially in *Epistula* 364. This content receives more attention later in this study.

<sup>490</sup> Drecol, *Op. cit.*, 35-36. In Frage kommen insgesamt folgende Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse:  
i.) *Homilia* XXIV ist von Ps-Ath abhängig.

Ps-Ath gehört doch Athanasius, *Homilia* XXIV Basilii; *Homilia* XXIV wäre dann ein besonders starkes Zeugnis für den auch sonst bemerkbaren Athanasiusgebrauch des Basilii.

Ps-Ath gehört Athanasius, *Homilia* XXIV nicht Basilii; *Homilia* XXIV wäre dann ein Zeugnis für die Wirkungsgeschichte des Alexandriner.

Ps-Ath gehört Apollinaris oder einem anderen Nizäner aus dem Umfeld des Athanasius; *Homilia* XXIV dagegen ist basilianisch. Diese These würde auch noch nicht bedeuten, daß die gesamte

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

i.) *Homilia XXIV* depends on Ps.-Ath.

Ps.-Ath. is yet Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is Basilian; *Homilia XXIV* would be a very strong testimony to the otherwise too noticeable Athanasian tradition of Basil.

Comment: This is possible but not probable. The weight of modern scholarship points to an author other than Athanasius for *Contra Sabellianos* [see *infra* chapter 2].

Ps.-Ath. is by Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is not by Basil; *Homilia XXIV* would be part of the reception of Athanasius.

Comment: This too is possible but unlikely. The weight of modern scholarship points to another author than Athanasius for *Contra Sabellianos* [see *infra* chapter 2], and Basil is strongly considered to be the author of *Homilia XXIV*.

Ps.-Ath. is by Apolinarius or another pro-Nicene amongst the followers of Athanasius; *Homilia XXIV*, however, is Basilian. This thesis would not mean that the whole doctrine of the Trinity of Basil is Ps.-Ath.-dependent, the similarities are not so great with the *Contra Eunomium* that it would put *Homilia XXIV* before *C. Eunom.* Such early dating for *Homilia XXIV* appears unlikely.

Comment: This is the more probable case, and it is the one that aligns most closely with the scenario Hübner puts forward. A comparative analysis of content in the two treatises does not support Hübners' assertions on the one hand that Apolinarius is the author of *C. Sabell.* and on the other that Basil borrowed its entire Trinitarian doctrine.

---

Trinitätslehre des Basilios von Ps-Ath abhängig ist, den so groß sind die Übereinstimmungen z-B zu AE nicht, daß *Homilia XXIV* vor AE anzusetzen wäre. Eine solche Frühdatierung von *Homilia XXIV* erscheint eher unwahrscheinlich.

Ps-Ath gehört nicht Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* nicht Basilios. Die Klärung der Abhängigkeit zwischen beiden Werken hätte für die Analyse der basilianischen Trinitätslehre gar keine Bedeutung.

ii.) Ps-Ath ist ein Traktat, der *Homilia XXIV* benutzt. *Homilia XXIV* ist basilianisch oder ps-basilianisch und wird von einem Apollinaristen bei der Verfertigung eines grundsätzlicheren Traktats miteingebaut. Eine athanasianische Verfasserschaft scheidet dann wohl aus (denn *Homilia XXIV* ist wohl nach 373 anzusetzen); Apollinaris als Verfasser ist unwahrscheinlich, wenn auch nicht unmöglich.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Ps.-Ath. is not by Athanasius, *Homilia XXIV* is not by Basil.  
Clarifying the relationship between the two works would not add meaning to the Basilian Trinity.

Comment: This is possible but not probable. In light of modern scholarship there is reason to say that the author of *C. Sabell.* is someone other than Athanasius; yet with regard to who is the author of *Homilia XXIV*, the weight of modern scholarship points to Basil [see *infra* chapter 2].

ii.) Ps.-Ath. is a treatise using *Homilia XXIV*. *Homilia XXIV* is Basilian or Ps.-Basilian and is constructed by an Apolinarist. An Athanasian authorship is excluded and *Homilia XXIV* then dates after 373; Apolinarius as the author is unlikely if not impossible.

Comment: This too is possible but unlikely. There is strong evidence to date the Ps.-Ath. treatise *C. Sabell.* before Basil's *Homilia XXIV* [see *infra* chapters 1 and 2].

According to Drecoll, these other four possible explanations need not be excluded, especially since the last of these options has a lot of merit. Under the heading *De amuletis* the *Codex Reg.* 2423, folio 150 a.o. quotes from Ps.-Ath (*PG* 26:1320f), and indeed it is the passage where Ps.-Ath. and *Homilia XXIV* match, namely Ps.-Ath., 109AC. The citation contains first 109C, then 109A, quoting in reverse order, leaving mainly the Bible quotations out, the wording of it is closer to Ps.-Ath. than to *Homilia XXIV*. That a match between *Homilia XXIV* and Ps.-Ath. has been handed down, and is found in Ps.-Ath. extended by several Bible quotes, makes it possible that Ps.-Ath. 109ABC is the later incorporation of an isolated fragment, which is derived from *Homilia XXIV*.<sup>491</sup> This fits well with the observation that in Ps.-Ath. only four points (97CD; 116BC; 100CD; 109AC) touch *Homilia XXIV*. 109ABC is also comparable to 116BC, when the passage of the match in *Homilia XXIV* and Ps.-Ath. derives largely by way of the extensive quotation from 2 *Corinthians* 3:18. 100C also contains quotes from the Bible more than the corresponding passage in *Homilia XXIV*. There is need therefore to consider the possibility that Ps.-Ath. in its present form is confused with another Ps.-Athanasius (*Peri tes tou Yiou aidiou hyparxeos tou Yiou kai tou Pneumatou syn Theou*) with fragments from *Homilia*

---

<sup>491</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 35-37, 138-140.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

XXIV (+ *kai pros tous Sabellizontas?*); such a confusion is attested for *Homilia XXV* with *Homilia XXIII*. This possibility is more probable than the supposition of Hübner that in 375, when the Eustathians accused Basil of Sabellianism because of his former contacts with Apolinarius, Basil as a bishop and trained rhetorician answered by challenging the validity of the evidence the Eustathians claimed to have against him by using and quoting Apolinarius.<sup>492</sup>

### *Hübner's and Drecoll's Findings*

What possible implications can be drawn from the findings of Hübner and Drecoll that bear upon late fourth-century development of orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit?

Hübner makes reference to the correspondence between Apolinarius and Basil of Caesarea (*Epistulae* 361-362 in *PG* 32:1099-1108) with a view to establishing two facts: 1) a direct use of ideas in common between the writers on the 'divine ousia', and 2) to establish the latest probable date for the exchange of Basil's request (*Epistula* 361) to Apolinarius and Apolinarius' answer (*Epistula* 362) to Basil.<sup>493</sup>

In Hübner's findings it is constructive to note the affinity of ideas about the Holy Spirit, where Pseudo-Athanasius [Hübner's 'Apolinarius'] in *Contra Sabellianos* coincides with Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*: 1) The baptismal command (*Matt.* 28:19) is cited to show that the Holy Spirit is with the Trinity and no created things can be added to the Trinity;

2) Although the teaching on the Holy Spirit is not overly developed yet in *Contra Sabellianos*, for example, the Spirit is not called 'image of the Son' but is considered to be the 'Spirit of the Son'. As such, he reveals the form of the Godhead, which has its origin in the Father and shines forth in the Son [Ps.-Athanasius, *C. Sabell.* 11, 12 (11B-C)].<sup>494</sup>

Hübner's assertion that Pseudo-Athanasius is actually Apolinarius is interesting, but with Drecoll, at least, remains unproven. Hübner's finding that there was a

---

<sup>492</sup> Drecoll, *Op. cit.*, 35-37.

<sup>493</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 237.

<sup>494</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 242, 247-250.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

use of ideas in common about the Holy Spirit between Pseudo-Athanasius in *Contra Sabellianos* and Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* appears to be suggested by the evidence.

As introduced above in this survey, Reinhard M. Hübner analysed the *Contra Sabellianos* of Pseudo-Athanasius. Hübner names Apolinarius of Laodicea as the author of this treatise against Photinus of Sirmium (a writer in the tradition of Marcellus of Ancyra). Further analysis has lead Hübner to suggest that *Contra Sabellianos* was written possibly in the years 355-360, and no later than 371. Hübner argues that the *Contra Sabellianos* widely influenced other authors.<sup>495</sup>

The identity of the author is by no means proven. Yet, as Hübner insightfully recognised, *Contra Sabellianos* is a promising source in the search for theological ideas that bear upon the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit.<sup>496</sup>

Since the first two parts of *Contra Sabellianos* focus on the relation of the Father and the Son, it is more to purpose to survey the third part of the treatise, which contains theological content on the Holy Spirit. A search of this last part of *Contra Sabellianos* yields significant theological content on the Holy Spirit.<sup>497</sup>

Pseudo-Athanasius offers the following descriptions of the Holy Spirit.

- 1) *John* 14:16 shows that the Son, Father and Spirit form the Trinity.<sup>498</sup>
- 2) The Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>499</sup>

---

<sup>495</sup> Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 367. Cf. Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 47-125.

<sup>496</sup> Cf. Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 108-125.

<sup>497</sup> Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 369.

<sup>498</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:100D-101A. Ὅταν οὖν περὶ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ, «Ἐγώ,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς, «Ἐκεῖνος,» περὶ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, «ἄλλος,» πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία,

<sup>499</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:112D.; Ἄνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἀνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννῶν ὑποπεύσης. PG 28:113A; δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκλήρώσατο. PG 28:113C;

3) That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not material does not make them nonexistent.<sup>500</sup>

4) God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the *hypostases* are differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o*.<sup>501</sup> This differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>502</sup>

5) While retaining the use of prepositions to differentiate the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Pseudo-Athanasius asserts that in the Trinity perceptible to humankind God's activity (*energeia*) is one (117A), and, likewise, that God's form (*eidos*) is one.<sup>503</sup>

At this point it is useful to compare the descriptions of the Holy Spirit that appear in *Contra Sabellianos* with those in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. Athanasius wrote

---

Δῶμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς βραχείας τινὰς εἰκόνας ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀσωμάτων, τινῶν ἐπιμνησθέντες πραγμάτων, ἃ δὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως φαίνεται, εἴ πως δυνηθεῖεν διὰ τούτων ἀναβαίνοντες ἐννοήσαι πῶς τὸ ἀσώματον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι τόπους αὐτῶν, μηδὲ τοπικὰς διαιρέσεις τῆς Τριάδος ἐπινοεῖν.

<sup>500</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116A; Ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέηται πλείονων τόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τόποις διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱὸν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτω· ὅτι μηδὲ ἔστι τόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστω. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 384.

<sup>501</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:113A; Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. PG 28: 117A; Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. PG 28:117B; Ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τοῦτο συμπλέξας τὸ ἐξ οὗ, καὶ δι' οὗ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ, βιάζομαι τὴν Τριάδα μονάδα ποιεῖν. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 384.

<sup>502</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:116C; ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. cit.*, 385.

<sup>503</sup> Ps. Athan., *Op. cit.*, PG 28:117A. συντιθεῖς. Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκουόντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὴ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Cf. Lienhard, *Op. Cit.*, 385.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

the *Epistulae ad Serapionem* on the nature of the Holy Spirit during his third exile from Alexandria and before the death of Emperor Constantius in about the year 361.<sup>504</sup> The ideas that form Athanasius' principles concerning the Holy Spirit can be compared with those that Pseudo-Athanasius presents in *C. Sabell.* as follows.

Pseudo-Athanasius presents his first pneumatological principle in *Contra Sabellianos* with his statement that the Holy Spirit shares unity of substance with the Father and Son. Similarly, Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* describes the Holy Spirit as a Person (*prosopon*) of the Trinity; also, there is use of the term *hypostases* to mean 'persons' rather than 'substances'.

In *Epp. ad Serap.* Athanasius supports the Holy Spirit's unity of substance with the Father and the Son in a related principle, which states that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. Athanasius gives the supporting idea that '...the Son is called Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father is called Spirit of the Son. Thus the Godhead of the Holy Triad and faith therein is one.'<sup>505</sup> While Pseudo-Athanasius has made both claims (in separate parts of his text), Athanasius brings them together in a way that Pseudo-Athanasius does not. For Pseudo-Athanasius the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, he does not reach the conclusion that the Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. Pseudo-Athanasius' starting point from *John* 14:16 leads in a different direction from that of Athanasius who arrives at this principle from references to *Galatians* 3:2; 3:14; 4:6-7.

A second principle Ps.-Athanasius argues in *C. Sabell.* is that the Trinity is not to be thought of in material terms but in a spiritual manner.<sup>506</sup>

---

<sup>504</sup> Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 16.

<sup>505</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:16; 103.

<sup>506</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 230, 242. PG 28:112D. 'Ἄνελε δὴ μοι τὸν ἐν τόπῳ ἐστηριγμένον, ὅτε διανοῇ περὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἄνελε τοπικοὺς χωρισμοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν Πατέρα ὄντα, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπέμπειν ἐκ τοῦ γεννᾶν ὑποπτεύσης. Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ ψευδεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἄθεοι λογισμοί, περὶ τὴν ὕπαρξιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σε σκανδαλίζουσι. Συνεξήρνηται δέ σοι μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, διὰ τοῦ ὕφ' ἐνὸς προκατέχεσθαι πάντα τοῦ Πατρὸς.' 113A-B. 'Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτὲ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληγεν, ἢ τὸ

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Athanasius employs an illustration of light-radiance-enlightenment to describe the Holy Spirit's affinity with the 'Holy Triad': 'As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance ... we may see in the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened.'<sup>507</sup> Athanasius draws upon 1 *Corinthians* 12:13 in this imagery to show how believers experience the Trinity as 'Spirit'.

A third principle Ps.-Athanasius sets forth in *C. Sabell.* is that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit being incorporeal does not make them nonexistent.<sup>508</sup>

Athanasius presents the illustrations of 'fountain and river' and 'light and radiance' to show the principle that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son and that the Spirit is engaged in the activity of the Son. '...as the Son is in the Spirit ...so the Father is in the Son'.<sup>509</sup>

A fourth principle Ps.-Athanasius describes in *C. Sabell.* is that God created the universe and perfects it through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The creative and perfecting activity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is indivisible, yet the

---

Πνεῦμα τίνα οἶκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.' 113C. 'Δῶμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς βραχείας τινὰς εἰκόνας ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀσωμάτων, τινῶν ἐπιμνησθέντες πραγμάτων, ἃ δὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως φαίνεται, εἴ πως δυνηθεῖεν διὰ τούτων ἀναβαίνοντες ἐννοῆσαί πως τὸ ἀσώματον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι τόπους αὐτῶν, μηδὲ τοπικὰς διαιρέσεις τῆς Τριάδος ἐπινοεῖν.' Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>507</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-111, in note I:19.8: Shapland suggests 'radiance from light' may be the original meaning of the phrase in the Nicene Creed, *phos ek photos*, rather than a separate light drawn from the source. τοῦ τοίνυν πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ. (τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις). ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ φωτίζομεθα, Χριστός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων· «ἦν» γάρ, φησί, «τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον». πάλιν τε τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ πνεῦμα· γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι «ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν».

<sup>508</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105. PG 28:116A-B. 'Πόσος γὰρ ἂν τῷ μεγέθει γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, ἐξήρκεσεν εἰς τὴν τοσοῦτον ὑποδοχὴν, εἰ τοποῖς μεμερισμένοις τῶν θεωρημάτων ἕκαστα εἶχεν; Ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἐνταῦθα πνευματικὰ μὴ δέηται πλείονων τόπων πλείονα ὄντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν στρέφεται νοῦν, ἐννοήσωμεν καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα ἀσώματα, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ τόπων δεόμενα, μηδὲ τοποῖς διαιρούμενα· καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνύπαρκτον ἢ τὸν Πατέρα τις, ἢ τὸν Υἱὸν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑποτίθεσθαι τολμάτω· ὅτι μὴδὲ ἔστι τόπον ἀφορίζειν καὶ κατανέμειν ἐκάστω. Ἀλλ' ἔστι μὲν ὁ Πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνελλιπὲς, ρίζα καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἔστι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν πλήρει τῇ θεότητι, ζῶν Λόγος, καὶ γέννημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνενδεές· πλήρες δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐ μέρος ἐτέρου, ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ Τριάς, ἀληθινῶς οὕσα, συνῆπται μὲν ἀδιαστάτως.' Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>509</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19-20, III:1; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 108-118, 170.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

*hypostases* [Persons] are differentiated in the prepositions *to ek ou, kai di ou, kai en o*.<sup>510</sup>

Athanasius addresses the idea of the unity of activity in the Trinity and the distinction of the Persons in two ways that connect with that of Ps.-Athanasius. Firstly, in support of the principle of the close relationship of the Holy Spirit with God, Athanasius presents the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one.'<sup>511</sup> Secondly, he distinguishes the Person of the Holy Spirit, 'The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word.'<sup>512</sup> Working from 1 *Corinthians* 12:4-6, Athanasius shows that the gifts which originate with the Father are given through the Son and distributed by the Holy Spirit.

A fifth principle Ps.-Athanasius asserts in *C. Sabell.* is that this differentiation is perceptible to humankind as the form of the One, originating from the Father, Shining forth in the Son and becoming apparent through the Spirit.<sup>513</sup>

---

<sup>510</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. *PG* 28:113A-B. 'Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· διὰ γὰρ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ συνεστήσατο, καὶ συνέχων διαφυλάττει. Ἀσεβὲς τοίνυν καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ἐννοεῖν τὸ ποῦ ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἢ ὁ Λόγος τίνα τόπον εἴληχεν, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τίνα οἴκησιν ἐκκληρώσατο.' 117A. 'Ἀχώριστα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεωρούμενα, ἀκούοντες τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μυσταγωγούντος καὶ φάσκοντος· «Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.» Καὶ καταλέξας τὰ χαρίσματα ἐπιφέρει· «Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω, καθὼς βούλεται.» Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῇται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.' 117B. 'Καὶ μὴν ὅτι οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος πρὸς Γαλάτας δυσχυρίζεται. Ἄλλ' εἰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁμώνυμος ἡμῖν, δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐχ οἶος ὁ πρότερος γηγενής, καὶ ὁ μὲν ψυχὴ ζῶσα, ὁ δὲ Πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 384.

<sup>511</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῷ νήφ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡταί τῷ πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρί καὶ νήφ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατήρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>512</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; 141.

<sup>513</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 106. *PG* 28:116C-D. 'Μὴ τοίνυν ὡς ἐνσώματα ἀδιαίρετα μέρη φανταζόμεθα τρία. Δυσσεβὴς γὰρ ὁ λογισμὸς, ἀλλότριος ἀσωμάτων τελείων. Ἀδιαίρετον δεχόμεθα συνουσίαν συνόντων ἀλλήλοις ἀδιαστάτως, καὶ τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑφεστώτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐννοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, λάμψαν δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ Πνεύματος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα φοροῦντες φοροῦσι Χριστόν· «Εἰ γὰρ τις,» φησί, «Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Athanasius depicts the Holy Spirit as the ‘drink’ that comes to the believer from the Father as ‘fountain’ through the Son as ‘river’, and as the ‘enlightenment’ that comes to the believer from the Father as ‘light’ through the Son as ‘radiance’. Athanasius illustrates this activity of the Holy Spirit as given in *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.<sup>514</sup>

A sixth principle Ps.-Athanasius posits in *C. Sabell.* is that the Father exists and has perfect and unfailing being, the root and source of the Son and the Spirit. The Son also exists possessing full deity, the living Word and Offspring without lack of the Father. And the Spirit of the Son is also perfect, not a part of the other [that is, of the Son], but complete in himself. And thus the Triad truly exists and is indivisibly united. For there is nothing that divides it, and it coexists eternally, since no time occurs between [the persons].<sup>515</sup>

Athanasius illustrates this unity of being in the Trinity with, ‘Again, as the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink of the Spirit. For it is written: “We are all made to drink of one Spirit”.’<sup>516</sup> Also, Athanasius upholds the full divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity with, ‘But the creatures, as has been said, are quickened through him. He that does not partake of life, but who is himself partaken and quickens the creatures, what kinship can he have with things originated? How can he belong to the creatures which in him are quickened from the Word?’<sup>517</sup> As noted in the second principle above, Athanasius shows from 1 *Cor.* 12:13 that the Holy Spirit distributes the gifts which the Father bestows through the Son, and to emphasize that this is only possible for a divine Person of the Trinity.

A seventh principle Ps.-Athanasius presents in *C. Sabell.* is that God’s activity is one and indivisible, God’s *eidos* or form (that which humankind can perceive in

---

ἀμαρτίαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης· «Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.» Καὶ ναὸν μὲν ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ὁ Παῦλος ὀνομάζει, Χριστὸν δὲ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι λέγει. Χριστοῦ δὲ οἰκοῦντος εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Θεός ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν· «Οὐκ οἶδατε, γὰρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἔστε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.» Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>514</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:6, PG 26:533B; *John* 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6.

<sup>515</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 105-106. PG 28:116A-B. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>516</sup> 1 *Cor.* 12:13; *Ep. ad Serap.* I:19; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 111-112.

<sup>517</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:23; Shapland, (1951), 123.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

God) is one. God is one *physis* (immanently) and one *eidos* (economically) with one *energeia* in three *prosopa*; the characteristics of the three *prosopa* are expressed by the prepositions *ek*, *dia* and *en*.<sup>518</sup>

Athanasius demonstrates that the Spirit has the same rank and function (*physis*) relative to the Son, as the Son bears to the Father (*Ep. ad Serap.* I.21): the Spirit is called, and is in fact, the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father (*ib.* I.24, cf. I.20): the Spirit is not external to the Logos but by reason of being in the Logos is therefore through Him in God (*ib.* 3.5).<sup>519</sup> Athanasius further supports the Holy Spirit's full divinity with the principle that the Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead. 'This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one. ...that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from the one God. Him [the Holy Spirit] therefore who is no creature but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, who is glorified with the Father and the Son, who is confessed as God with the Word, who is active in the works which the Father works through the Son...' <sup>520</sup> is beyond the created order. From 2 *Cor.* 13:13, the Trinitarian (or Apostolic) benediction, Athanasius draws a statement of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Who distributes the grace that the Father bestows through the Son on the faithful. 'For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and lambent grace.'<sup>521</sup>

If Pseudo-Athanasius' *Contra Sabellianos* and Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* were produced in the early 360s and within one to three years of each other then the apparent inclusion of the principles and ideas in Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* would suggest some of these ideas are used in common between Pseudo-Athanasius and Athanasius. These ideas support part of the argument in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* and, as such, are significant to the development of pro-Nicene teaching on the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>518</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, (1989), 108-109. PG 28:117A. Cf. Lienhard, (1986), 385.

<sup>519</sup> Prestige, *GPT*, 251.

<sup>520</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:31; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142-143. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. οὐ γὰρ ὡς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν τριάδι δίδονται καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστι. τὸ τοίνυν μὴ ὄν κτίσμα, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῷ υἱῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὡς πατρί, τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργοῦν τε ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐργάζεται,

<sup>521</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.* I:30; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951), 142.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Drecol focuses on ideas used in common between Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea. A comparison and analysis of Athanasius' *Epistulae ad Serapionem* and Basil's *C. Eunomium III* yields the following:

As discussed above, Athanasius in *Epistulae ad Serapionem*<sup>522</sup> (ca 361) argues for these principles on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit:

(1) The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father (on *Galatians* 3:2; 3:14; 4:6-7);

(2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son (on *John* 15:26, 16:15; *Matt.* 3:17; *Gal.* 4:6);

(3) The Holy Spirit gives life (on *Rom.* 8:11; *John* 4:14, 7:39);

(4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal (on 1 *John* 2:27; *Gal.* 4:19; 2 *Peter* 1:4);

(5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy (on *Ezekiel* 36:26; *Micah* 1:1; *Jeremiah* 1:1);

(6) The Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son (on *Luke* 1:35; *Colossians* 1:20);

(7) The Holy Spirit 'in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things' participates in the activity of the Godhead (on 2 *Corinthians* 13:13).

Basil of Caesarea in *C. Eunomium III* (written in about the year 364) argues against Eunomius' 'blasphemy' that the Holy Spirit is third in dignity, order *and* nature. Basil challenges Eunomius' claim that this doctrine carries authority from the 'saints'. Basil asserts that both the Son and the Holy Spirit are of the same divine nature (*physis*) as the Father.<sup>523</sup> Basil calls on *Isaiah* 6:3 to support his point that the Holy Spirit has the holiness of nature that the Father and the Son

---

<sup>522</sup> *Ep. ad Serap.*; PG 26:520B, 523B, 533B, 537B; Shapland, *Letters*, (1951).

<sup>523</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium – liber tertius*, PG 29:656A-660D. '...Καὶ ὡςπερ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ Υἱός, οὕτω φύσει ἅγιον καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.' See also, M. Anastos, 'Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίου', in P.J. Fedwick, *Op. cit.* (Toronto, 1981), 111-118.

have.<sup>524</sup> Basil builds upon his argument that the three Persons of the Trinity have the same holiness by showing from *John* 4:24 that the Father is referred to as ‘Spirit’ and from 2 *Corinthians* 3:17 that the Son too is called ‘Spirit’. This community (*koinonia*) of holiness of nature that the Holy Spirit has with the Father and the Son, Basil says, shows that the Holy Spirit is good in the way that God is good.<sup>525</sup> Basil then uses *John* 14:16 to show that the Son (who Himself was Advocate) would send the Holy Spirit as ‘another Advocate’ (*Parakleton*), thus showing the glory of the Holy Spirit.<sup>526</sup> Basil proceeds to argue that the Holy Spirit participates in the active work (*energeia*) of God – the Holy Spirit is the ‘Spirit of adoption’ (on *Romans* 8:15), a Teacher (on *John* 14:26), a Bestower of grace (on 1 *Corinthians* 12:4-6)<sup>527</sup> – and this demonstrates the Holy Spirit’s divinity of nature (*to theion tes physeos*).<sup>528</sup> Basil continues to extol the Holy

---

<sup>524</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:660D-661A. ‘Εἰ οὖν φύσις αὐτῷ ὁ ἁγιασμός ἐστιν, ὥσπερ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, πῶς τρίτης ἐστὶ καὶ ἄλλοτρίας φύσεως;’

<sup>525</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661A-B. ‘Ἐκ δὲ τούτων παντὶ δῆλον, ὅτι οὐχὶ ἄλλοτρίωσιν τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ’ οἰκείωσιν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν ἢ κοινωνία τῶν ὀνομάτων παρίστησι.’

<sup>526</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661B. ‘Ἐν ᾧ δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος ὅτι, Ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον Παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς εἶναι Παράκλητος ἡμῶν ἐνδείκνυται. Ὡστε καὶ ἡ τοῦ παρακλήτου προσήγορία οὐ μικρὸν πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος συντελεῖ.’

<sup>527</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:661B-664B. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα τοιαῦτα τοῦ μεγαλείου τῆς φύσεως ἐνδεικτικά· αἱ δὲ ἐνέργειαι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος οἶαι; Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, φησὶν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν, καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν. Ὡς τοίνυν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος δημιουργὸς ἐστὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ στερεὸν καὶ πάγιον τῆς ἀρετῆς παρέχεται ταῖς οὐρανίαις δυνάμεσι. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰώβ· Πνεῦμα Κυρίου τὸ ποιήσαν με· οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς δημιουργίας, ὡς οἶμαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ἀρετὴν τελειώσεως λέγων. Ὁ δὲ Ἡσαΐας ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου διαλεγόμενος, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ δηλονότι, Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με, φησὶ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ψαλμὸς, δι’ ὧν κεχωρηκέναι δύναμιν τοῦ Πνεύματος παριστάς, Ποῦ πορευθῶ, φησὶ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματός σου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω; Αἱ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ φθάνουσαι εὐεργεσίαι ὁποῖαι τινὲς εἰσι καὶ ἡλίκαι; Ὡς περ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν τοῖς δεξαμένοις αὐτὸν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον Πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας ἐστὶ. Καὶ ὥς περ διδάσκαλός ἐστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ καλέσατε διδάσκαλον ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εἷς γὰρ καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός· οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διδάσκειν πάντας τοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου πεπιστευκότας, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου μεμαρτύρηται, εἰπόντος· Ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ Πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα. Καὶ ὥς περ διαιεῖν τὰ ἐνεργήματα εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους τῆς ὑποδοχῆς τῶν ἐνεργημάτων ὁ Πατήρ λέγεται, καὶ διαιεῖν τὰς διακονίας ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τοῖς τῆς διακονίας ἀξιώμασιν· οὕτω διαιεῖν καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους τῆς τῶν χαρισμάτων ὑποδοχῆς μαρτυρεῖται. Διαιρέσεις γὰρ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

<sup>528</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:664B. ‘Ὅρᾳς πῶς καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐνέργεια συντεταγμένη ἐστὶ τῇ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ ἐνεργεῖα; Εἴτα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπαγομένου μειζόνως τὸ θεῖον τῆς φύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φανεροῦται.’

Spirit's divine attributes, saying that the Spirit 'searches the deep things of God' (on 1 *Corinthians* 2:10) and 'no man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God' (1 *Cor.* 2:11). He says that 'the Spirit within us will quicken our mortal bodies' (*Romans* 8:11).<sup>529</sup> Basil condemns as blasphemous the anhomioian description Eunomius applies to the Holy Spirit, as the Son's first and greatest creation (*poiema*) lacking divine nature or power.<sup>530</sup> Such a description, Basil argues, does not properly recognize that when the Spirit of God dwells within believers (on 1 *Cor.* 3:16) and perfects them, such perfecting activity (*theosis*) is the work of a divine Holy Spirit.<sup>531</sup> The Holy Spirit, Basil says, Who is invoked in the baptismal formula (*Matthew* 28:19) must be divine because only a divine member of the Trinity, not a creature (*ktisma*), is able to bring about the grace of this holy rite.<sup>532</sup> Basil argues against Eunomius' conclusion that if only God is *anarchos* and *agennetos* and only the Son is *gennema* then that leaves the Holy Spirit to be *ktisma* and *poiema*. Basil replies that since the sanctifier is above those that are sanctified, the teacher is above those that are taught, and the revealer is aware of what is revealed, then the Spirit must be above creation.<sup>533</sup> Eunomius supports his conclusion that the Spirit is a created being with exegeses from two Bible [Septuagint] verses: *Amos* 4:13 and *John* 1:3 to show in the first instance that God 'creates the spirit' (*Amos* 4:13) and, in the second, God 'made all things' (*John* 1:3). Basil challenges Eunomius' interpretation of the text of *Amos* 4:13 on the basis that an action of creation of the Spirit (*pneuma*) would have been described as a single action occurring in the past; the fact that the

---

<sup>529</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:664C-665A.

<sup>530</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665A-B.

<sup>531</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665B-C.

<sup>532</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665C-D. "Ὁ γὰρ χάριτι θεοποιούμενος τῆς μεταπτωτῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως, ἐξ ἀπροσεξίας ποτὲ καὶ ἀπορρέουσιν τοῦ κρείττονος. Τοῦτο δὲ σαφῶς μάχεται τῇ παραδόσει τοῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος. Πορευθέντες, φησὶ, βαπτίζετε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἔστι γὰρ τὸ βάπτισμα σφραγὶς τῆς πίστεως, ἡ δὲ πίστις θεότητος συγκατάθεσις. Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον, εἴτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι. Τὸ δὲ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου παράδοσιν, εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· οὐδενὸς κτίσματος, οὐδὲ δούλου Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συντεταγμένου, ὡς τῆς θεότητος ἐν Τριάδι συμπληρουμένης."

<sup>533</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom.* III, PG 29:665D-668C. "Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὴν κτίσιν ἐστὶν, ἱκανῶς ἡμῖν παρίστησι τὰ διὰ τῶν Γραφῶν παραδιδόμενα, ἐπειδὴ γε ἀδύνατον τῆς αὐτῆς εἶναι φύσεως τὸ τε ἁγιάζον καὶ τὰ ἁγιαζόμενα, τὸ διδάσκον καὶ τὰ διδασκόμενα, τὸ ἀποκαλύπτον καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως προσδεόμενα."

verse describes a continuous action in the present clearly indicates weather.<sup>534</sup> Basil then refutes Eunomius' interpretation of *John* 1:3 that amongst 'all things' created was the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit, Basil repeats, by virtue of holiness of nature, is beyond creation.<sup>535</sup>

Drecoll does not delve into a similarity of ideas between Athanasius and Apolinarius, since he has shown that there is no great influence of Apolinarius on Basil in the 360s, then perhaps it can be inferred that Drecoll sees very little common use of ideas between Athanasius and Apolinarius.

### ***Topics not argued by Hübner and Drecoll***

Hübner argues for the similarity of ideas between Pseudo-Athanasius (and Apolinarius) and both Basil and Athanasius. Where Hübner has the force of historical scholarship with him, he argues for the influence of Apolinarius upon Basil and Athanasius.<sup>536</sup> His view is of a movement of ideas from Apolinarius outward. Hübner assumes the primacy of the ideas of Pseudo-Athanasius and Apolinarius over those of Basil and Athanasius. An example of where this view can leave scholars in a quandary is with the *Epistulae* 361-364 between Basil and Apolinarius. While the authenticity and authorship of these letters is gaining acceptance amongst modern scholars, the order of these letters is by no means settled.<sup>537</sup> It specifically served Hübner's purpose to make a brief mention of these letters. There is interesting theological content in this correspondence, specifically in *Epistula* 364, which has implications for the development of doctrine on the Holy Spirit and so bears closer examination.<sup>538</sup>

Apollinaris [*sic*] to my master and longed-for brother Basil, greeting in the Lord. Think of the situation in which I have been myself, master, and say what has happened to your longed-for voice or the normal letter. Why do you not come to our help in person or at least shout encouragement from afar, since this great war has broken out against orthodoxy, and we are like men in the middle of the battle-

---

<sup>534</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:668D-669C.

<sup>535</sup> Basil, *C. Eunom. III*, PG 29:669C. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον καὶ μόνον, πῶς ὁ τῆς μοναδικῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως, τοῖς πᾶσι συμπαραλαμβάνεσθαι δύναται; Καὶ μηδεὶς οἰέσθω ἀθέτησιν εἶναι τῆς ὑποστάσεως τὴν ἄρνησιν τοῦ κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα.

<sup>536</sup> Hübner, *Die Schrift*, 242, 247-250.

<sup>537</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 21-28.

<sup>538</sup> Prestige, G. L., *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, (1956).

front, calling to our friends owing to the violence shown by the enemy? As for you, we have no means of seeking you out, since we cannot discover where you may happen to be staying. I inquired for you in the city of the Cappadocians, as a report came from people who had met you in Pontus that you had announced your intention to return there shortly; but I did not find you where I hoped. But now on hearing that you are still staying in the same parts I have immediately entrusted this letter to my informant. When you receive it, do not make his departure in your company a reason for not replying.

Let me tell you that in the meantime a visit has been paid us by bishops coming from Egypt, and a letter [Athanasius' *Ep. ad Jov.*] has been distributed in harmony with ancient formularies, both those of divine authority and those drawn up at Nicaea in unison with these. It was necessary to take up the same points again, together with an explanation, owing to the fallacious misinterpretation of established decisions. This used formerly to be expressed in flat contradictions, but nowadays they dissemble the contradiction by a pretence of interpretation. Hence came that malicious suppression of the *homoousion* on the ground that, on any Greek interpretation, the concept is inappropriate; and the introduction, instead of the *homo[i]ousion*, of "similar in substance". This has been deliberately invented, thought the terminology is slovenly and the meaning is ill-intentioned; for similarity applies to qualities inhering in the substance, not to substantive objects. The motive is to suggest a substance that bears the same sort of similarity that a statue might bear to the Emperor.

In reply to this the letter said – as would naturally be said by people of orthodox understanding and intention – that the *homoousion* declares the Son to be, not similar to God, but God, as being a genuine offspring and of the same substance as his begetter. The subject of the Spirit was introduced at the same time, to the effect that the fathers included him in the same confession of faith as the Father and the Son, because he has his being in the same deity.

Who was so obvious a person to act as spokesman for this orthodox view as your most worthy self, together with my master Gregory? – who likewise writes no letter from any address and sends no single piece of information. Farewell, most longed-for master.<sup>539</sup>

---

<sup>539</sup> Apolinarius, *Ep. 364*, in *PG* 32 and Riedmatten, *La correspondance I*, 203-204; English translation in *Prestige*, *St Basil*, 39-43. Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ ποθεινοτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ Βασιλείῳ Ἀπολινάριος ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν. Ποῦ μὲν ἤμην αὐτός, δέσποτα, ποῦ δὲ ἡ ποθεινοτάτη φωνὴ καὶ γράμμα τὸ σύνηθες; Τί δὲ οὐ παρὼν ἀμύνεις ἢ καὶ ἀπὼν παρακελεύεις, πολέμου τοσούτου κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐρρωγότες καὶ ἡμῶν οἷον ἐν μέσῃ παρατάξει βοώντων πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους διὰ τὴν

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

In *Epistula 364*, Apolinarius attests to the emergence of debate and doctrinal definition on the nature and being of the Holy Spirit.

Returning to the discussion of Hübner and Drecoll, it is noted that Drecoll identifies Basil's diversion from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification.<sup>540</sup> This diversion towards an emphasis on the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification is discernible in both Basil and Athanasius, albeit from divergent starting points, and is a promising area for further study. It is compelling to explore what influences were at work to bring each of them to that view. Drecoll explores and describes Basil's struggle to move from a homoiousian tradition and view towards a new and impactful understanding of the Holy Spirit. What is open for further study is to trace what and who enabled Basil to arrive at that view and to compare his understanding of the role and nature of the Holy Spirit with that of his mentors and contemporaries.

Drecoll seems to say that in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* Athanasius directs his lengthy argument from Christology only to those opponents to a divine Holy Spirit who were not influenced by neo-Arian ideas;<sup>541</sup> and, as such, Drecoll does

---

ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων βίαν; Σὲ δὲ οὐδ' ὅπως ἂν ζητήσωμεν ἔχομεν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ οὗ τυγχάνεις διατρίβων εὐρίσκομεν. Ἄλλ' ἐζήτησα μὲν ἐν τῇ Καπαδοκῶν, ἐπεὶ καὶ οὕτως ἡγγελλον οἱ ἐν Πόντῳ σοι περιτυχόντες ἐπηγγέλθαι σε θάπτον ἐπανήξειν, οὐχ εὖρον δὲ ἔνθα ἡλπίζον. Νῦν δὲ ἔτι σε κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάγοντα χώραν ἀκούσας εὐθὺς τῷ μηνυτῇ καὶ τὸ γράμμα ἐνεχείρισα. Ὅπερ δεξάμενος μὴ καὶ τοῦ ἀντιγράφειν ἀπόσχῃ ὥς καὶ τούτου συναποδημούντος. Ἴσθι δὲ ὡς ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ γέγονεν ἐπισκόπων ἐπιδημία τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ γράμματα διεδόθη σύμφωνα παλαιοῖς γράμμασιν τοῖς τε θείοις αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς καθ' ὁμοφωνίαν τῶν θείων ἐν Νικαίᾳ γραφεῖσιν. Ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἦν ἡ μετ' ἐξηγήσεως τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπανάληψις, διὰ τὴν οὐχ ὑγιῇ τῶν κειμένων παρεξήγησιν ἣν εἰσήγον οἱ πάλοι μὲν ἄντικρυς ἀντιλέγοντες, νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν ἐξηγήσεως σχήματι μεθοδεύσαντες· ἔνθα ἦν ἡ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου κακοῦργος ἀναίρεσις ὥς οὐκ ὀφείλοντος νοεῖσθαι κατ' οὐδεμίαν ἄρνησιν Ἑλληνικὴν· ἀντισταγωγὴ δὲ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὸ ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν, ὅπερ ἐπετηδεύθη χυδαίως ὀνομασθὲν καὶ κακοήθως νοηθέν, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ὁμοιότης τῶν ἐν οὐσίᾳ ἐστίν, οὐ τῶν οὐσιωδῶν, ἵνα δὴ οὕτως ὁμοιωμένη οὐσία νοῆται, οἷος ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀνδριάς πρὸς Βασιλέα. Πρὸς ἅπερ ἀντεγράφη τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν εὐσεβεῖν εἰδόντων καὶ βουλομένων, ὅτι οὐχ ὅμοιον Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν δηλοῖ τὸ ὁμοούσιον, ὡς ἂν γέννημα γνήσιον καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τῷ γεγεννηκότι. Συνεισήγετο δὲ καὶ τὸ περὶ Πνεύματος ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν Πατέρων ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πίστει τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ κειμένου, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ θεότητι. Τὴν οὖν τῆς εὐσεβείας ταύτης πρεσβείαν τίνα εἰκὸς ἦν οὕτω μετεῖναι ὥς τὸν σπουδαιότατον ἄμα τῷ δεσπότη μου Γρηγορίῳ, ὃς οὐδ' αὐτὸς οὐδαμόθεν γράφει οὐδὲ σημαίνει καθάπαξ οὐδέν; Ἐρρωσο, δέσποτα ποθεινότατε.

<sup>540</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 138-140.

<sup>541</sup> Drecoll, *Ibid.*

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

not offer a reason why Athanasius would have done so. In making this assumption about Athanasius' opponents, it is possible that Drecoll rules out a few promising reasons why Athanasius might have chosen to argue labouriously from Christology for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. With Athanasius, as with Basil, it is equally compelling to explore what influences were at work to bring him to his emergent view of the role and nature of the Holy Spirit.

As can be seen in the findings to this point, neither Hübner nor Drecoll have looked far beyond the proponents of a divine Holy Spirit in the exploration of the development of ideas on the theology of the Holy Spirit in the fourth century. In what follows, this study shall try to identify the early traces of this second stage of the development of doctrine on the Trinity, which followed the working out of the relation between the Father and Son.

Basil of Caesarea heralded his departure from the homoiousion view and arrival to the homoousion view when in *Contra Eunomium III* (written circa 364 or later) he argued that the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification proves the Spirit's divinity.<sup>542</sup> In his *Contra Eunomium III*, Basil argues point-by-point against Eunomius of Cyzicus over the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Basil inserts fragments of Eunomius' statements on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in the text of this treatise. The first fragment of Eunomius asserts that since the Son is the Only-begotten (subordinate to the Father and second in nature), so the Holy Spirit (subordinate to the Son) is third in dignity and order and as such third in nature.<sup>543</sup> Basil makes quick work of disproving this statement, assailing it as blasphemous and questioning Eunomius' claim that it is based in the 'teaching of the saints' (*doxais, ten de tōn hagion*). Basil proceeds to demonstrate that as the Son, even though He defers to the Father, is of the same divine nature as the Father, so the Holy Spirit, while in deference to the Son, is also of the same divine nature. In an insightful line of reasoning supported by Scriptural texts, Basil shows that the Holy Spirit's full divinity is attested by these activities (*energeiai*) – imparting grace, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, power - which

---

<sup>542</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:653A-669D.

<sup>543</sup> *Ibid.*, 653A.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

are uniquely of God.<sup>544</sup> The next fragment of Eunomius builds chain-like on the first with the statement that the Holy Spirit is third in order and nature by command of the Father, is a work of the Son Who created [the Spirit] to be third [in order and nature] and the first [and grandest] creation of the Only-begotten.<sup>545</sup> Basil, after condemning these words as blasphemous, continues his argument by describing with Scriptural texts more activities – abiding in believers and sanctifying them in baptism ‘in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit’ – which attest to the divinity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>546</sup> The last fragment of Eunomius gives the conclusion to the chain of his argument with his statement that [the Holy Spirit] is created, neither begotten nor unbegotten; only God is supreme (*anarchos*) and unbegotten (*agenetos*); therefore [the Holy Spirit] must be named a creation (*ktisma*) and a work (*poiema*).<sup>547</sup> Here Basil shifts the direction of his counter-argument to an exposition on the limits to the reach of human understanding, which concedes the Holy Spirit to be beyond our ken and above creation. Basil emphasizes that the Holy Spirit must be above creation (and of a higher nature) since that which sanctifies, teaches and reveals is of a nature other than that which receives sanctification, teaching and revelation.<sup>548</sup> Then, Basil refutes Eunomius’ exegeses from Scripture in this last link of his argument. Eunomius had applied two key Scriptural texts in support of his conclusion that the Holy Spirit is part of creation: *Amos* 4:13 and *John* 1:3. Eunomius put forward *Amos* 4:13 to show the Spirit (*pneuma*) to be created and *John* 1:3 to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is part of creation. Basil challenged Eunomius’ exegesis of *Amos* 4:13 on the basis of misreading and confusion of grammar by arguing first that ‘pneuma’ referred to ‘wind’ and not ‘Spirit’ and second that the meaning of the passage was of a continuous action (which recurs like weather) rather than a single act of creation that happened at a fixed point in time. Then Basil counters Eunomius’ exegesis of *John* 1:3 on the strength of the

---

<sup>544</sup> *Ibid.*, 661C-664B. *Matt.* 23:10; *John* 14:26; 1 *Cor.* 12:4-6,11.

<sup>545</sup> *Ibid.*, 665A.

<sup>546</sup> *Ibid.*, 665B-D. 1 *John* 3:24; 1 *Cor.* 3:16; *Eph.* 2:21, 22; *Matt.* 28:19.

<sup>547</sup> *Ibid.*, 665D-668A.

<sup>548</sup> Basil, *Contra Eunomium III*, PG 29:665D-668C.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

point already argued that the nature of the Holy Spirit is other than things created and so above creation.<sup>549</sup>

Thus, Basil, in an effort to strengthen the faith and doctrine of the Church that he understood to be essential to the sanctification and illumination of believers, responded to the antithetical statements of Eunomius. In his counter-argument, Basil composed statements that gave more shape and definition to the Church's teaching, especially with regard to the nature and role of the Holy Spirit as a Person of the Trinity Who sanctifies and enlivens believers. The two key theological ideas of *unity of divine substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit are addressed in formal statements.

Turning to how this approach is applied to the writings of Athanasius and his contemporaries, this study has found that in his *Tomus ad Antiochenos* Athanasius addresses the objections of Arian and semi-Arian opponents with an affirmation of the Nicene Creed and a condemnation of the doctrine that the 'Holy Spirit is a Creature...separate from the Essence of Christ'.<sup>550</sup> When Athanasius was in his third exile (ca 362) he was asked by Bishop Serapion of Thmuis to write in contravention to those who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In his *Epistulae ad Serapionem*<sup>551</sup> Athanasius argues for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit as an 'uncreated' member of the Holy Trinity with the roles to give life, inspire prophecy, and act in concert with the Son to perfect and renew all things.<sup>552</sup>

Drecolll seems to say that in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* Athanasius directs his lengthy argument from Christology only to those opponents to a divine Holy Spirit who were not influenced by neo-Arian ideas;<sup>553</sup> and, as such, Drecolll does not offer a reason why Athanasius would have done so. In making this assumption about Athanasius' opponents, it is possible that Drecolll rules out promising reasons why Athanasius might have chosen to argue labouriously from

---

<sup>549</sup> *Ibid.*, PG 29:668D-669B; Amos 4:13; John 1:3.

<sup>550</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. III*, NPNF<sup>2</sup> 2:81-82.

<sup>551</sup> Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistulae ad Serapionem I-III*, in C. R. B. Shapland, *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (New York, 1951); PG 26.

<sup>552</sup> *Epp. ad Serap. II-III.7*; Shapland, *Letters*, 162.

<sup>553</sup> Drecolll, *Op. cit.*, 138-140.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Christology for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The history of Athanasius' clashes with Arians in both Antioch and Alexandria<sup>554</sup> supports the idea that Athanasius felt the need in *Epistulae ad Serapionem* to underpin his argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit with a firm foundation in the unity of substance between the Father and the Son. This offers a promising explanation of why, in a treatise about the Holy Spirit, Athanasius argues from Christology in two thirds of the text, and then devotes the remaining third to the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

With application of this approach to the later writings of Basil and his contemporaries, this study has found that Basil, who had already begun to strengthen Church teaching with statements in *Contra Eunomium III* detailing the Holy Spirit's divinity and essential role in the sanctification and illumination of believers, felt compelled to argue against the opposition's view of the Holy Spirit as a creature different from and subordinate to the Son and by degrees superior to the other orders of creation.

Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* also offers descriptions that serve as markers indicative of the mind of the Church on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. In his search for authoritative evidence in support of his case for the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Basil drew from both Scripture and the 'unwritten' teaching of the forerunners and liturgical practices in the early Church, in particular the sacraments of baptism, anointing and Eucharist.<sup>555</sup> In doing so, Basil reminds his opponents that they have professed their faith and pledged themselves in service to a Church whose Scripture and tradition attest to the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit.<sup>556</sup>

As noted earlier in this study (see *infra* chapter 4) by the year 358, a group of conservative bishops sympathetic to the views of Basil of Ancyra advanced an homoiousion, or 'similar in substance', description of the Father and the Son, which emphasised the Father's role as 'Father' to the Son.<sup>557</sup> This view contrasted sharply from that of the anhomoians and neo-Arians who professed no

---

<sup>554</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 451-480.

<sup>555</sup> Basil, *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (PG 32:200B-D). Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* (NPNF 8:45-47).

<sup>556</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 152-155.

<sup>557</sup> C. R. B. Shapland, *Introduction to The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (1951), 21-22.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

commonality of nature between the Father and the Son. To the emergent understanding amongst pro-Nicenes that divinity can be proven by way of the action, *energeia*, of God the homoiousion argument provided the addition of proving divinity by describing the being, *to einai*, of God.<sup>558</sup> This use of ‘substance’ to describe divinity was then applied to the argument for the Holy Spirit. In their new appreciation for the shared divine nature of the Father and the Son, the conservatives distanced themselves from the neo-Arians and closed ranks with Athanasius of Alexandria and the pro-Nicene party. Athanasius with Basil of Caesarea and the pro-Nicenes came to describe the Holy Spirit in terms of both divine action and divine being.<sup>559</sup>

In about the year 374, Basil wrote *De Spiritu Sancto* to answer those amongst both the conservatives and neo-Arians who opposed the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit. In composing his treatise, Basil soon found that he needed to draw from both Scripture and tradition to support his argument for a fully-divine Holy Spirit. To present his evidence from unwritten teaching in a way that could not be easily dismissed for not being Scriptural, he appealed to the sacraments. Basil drew support from writers in the first three centuries of the Church to describe their prayers to the Holy Spirit in a variety of observances and invocations such that even the conservatives could not quickly dismiss them for risk of losing their own credibility as clerics.

Basil argued that what has come to the Church “in a mystery” by way of the received doxologies and liturgical formulae were inspired by Scripture. He showed too that both *dogma* and *kerygma* are valid responses to the Gospel and both have equal authority.

When Basil chose to base his argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit on the authority of Scripture and the ‘tradition of the apostles’ in the doxologies and liturgical formulae, he presented the mind of the Church as having a presupposition that the Holy Spirit is divine.

---

<sup>558</sup> R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (London, 2005) 352-357. For a classic exploration of the meanings of *homoousios* see G. Christopher Stead’s paper “The Concept of Divine Substance” in *Vigiliae Christianae* 29, no. 1 (March 1975): 1-14.

<sup>559</sup> Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 32.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Basil's arguments for the divinity of the Holy Spirit in his *Peri tou hagiou pneumatos* (*De Spiritu Sancto*) were based upon some of the principles that Athanasius had established a decade earlier in the *Epistulae ad Serapionem*. As noted earlier in this study (see *infra* chapter 4), Drecoll observed that Basil diverts from the view of the Holy Spirit characteristic of the 'Eusebian – Origen' tradition, when in *Contra Eunomium III* Basil emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in sanctification.<sup>560</sup> This study has traced the flow of ideas on the divinity of the Holy Spirit along distinct paths. The ideas that form Athanasius' Trinitarian principles applied to the Holy Spirit appear to varying extent in the writings of both Apolinarius and Basil. Given Basil's withdrawal from contact with Apolinarius after their brief exchange of letters in the 360s, it seems fair to conclude that the prevailing direction in the flow of ideas was from Athanasius outward first to Apolinarius and later to Basil.

The influence of Athanasius on Basil can be readily shown in a comparison of their principle points of argument in the works *Epistulae ad Serapionem* and *De Spiritu Sancto*. Athanasius in his *Epistulae ad Serapionem* gives these key principles about the Holy Spirit:

- (1) The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father;
- (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;
- (3) The Holy Spirit gives life;
- (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;
- (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;
- (6) The Holy Spirit participated in the Incarnation of the Son;
- (7) The Holy Spirit 'in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things' participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>561</sup>

Basil in *De Spiritu Sancto* presents these key principles about the Holy Spirit:

---

<sup>560</sup> Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 152-159.

<sup>561</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. ad Serap.*, in Shapland, *Op. cit.* I.9, 23; 82, 127.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

- (1) The Holy Spirit possesses fully and equally the divine nature with the Son and the Father;
- (2) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son;
- (3) The Holy Spirit gives life;
- (4) The Holy Spirit is unction and seal;
- (5) The Holy Spirit inspires prophecy;
- (6) The Holy Spirit gives gifts to the ‘worthy’;
- (7) The Holy Spirit participates in the activity of the Godhead.<sup>562</sup>

Considering the flow of the two key theological ideas – *unity of substance* and *divinity* of the Holy Spirit – in the years 358 to 378, it has been helpful in this study to trace them where they appear in the writings of both proponents *and* opponents. It is evident from doctrinal statements in these writings that the development of these two theological ideas came about in the struggle between the Homoousion party and their opponents, chiefly the Homoian semi-Arian party, the so-called ‘Eusebians’. Harnack offers the following assessment of this two-decade period:

...When the question as to the personality of the Spirit emerged, it was as quickly settled that it must be a *persona*, for the nature of God is not so poor that His Spirit cannot be a person. – (It has to be noted that *persona* and our “person” are not the same thing.) The views of Lactantius again on this point were different. Since the year 362 the orthodox at several councils in the West and then in Asia had pronounced in favour of the complete Godhead of the Spirit in opposition to the Arians, as we see from the Confession of Eunomius, and also to the Pneumatomachians.<sup>563</sup>

Harnack lists the doctrinal statement issued in that period that in his view did the most to shape the view of the Eastern Church on the divinity and worthiness of worship of the Holy Spirit as ‘the Epistle of the Alexandrian Council of 363, the

---

<sup>562</sup> Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8:36.

<sup>563</sup> Harnack, *Hist. Dogma* 4:117-118.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

declarations of the Westerns under Damasus in the years 369, 376, 377, [and] the resolution of an Illyrian Council.’<sup>564</sup> Harnack adds his observation that ‘[the Cappadocians] had apparently learned something from the letters of Athanasius [*Epistulae ad Serapionem*], for they repeat his arguments and give them more formal development.’<sup>565</sup>

The definition of the Holy Spirit’s *divinity* was added to the original Nicene Creed at the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381, which added four phrases to the original ‘And in the Holy Spirit’:<sup>566</sup>

And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life,  
Who proceeds from the Father,  
Who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and  
glorified,  
Who spoke by the prophets.

And, according to Sozomen, the decisions of the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople were enforced by Emperor Theodosius I:<sup>567</sup>

Such were the decrees of the council. They were confirmed by the emperor, who enacted that the faith established at Nicaea should be dominant, and that the churches everywhere should be placed in the hands of those who acknowledged one and the same Godhead in the hypostasis of three Persons of equal honor and of equal power; namely, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Thus, the twenty years of debate and struggle over the nature and role of the Holy Spirit resulted in an outcome that few of the proponents and opponents would have expected.

This study has shown that influences that Basil and Athanasius have in common are extant in the writings of Marcellus of Ancyra, Apolinarius of Laodicea, and each other. Basil and Athanasius also commonly held an abhorrence of and reaction against the doctrinal statements from Eusebius of Caesarea, Asterius of

---

<sup>564</sup> *Ibid.*, 118 note 2.

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>566</sup> *The Holy Creed*, In vol. 14 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, Second Series. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. (1900/1994), 163.

<sup>567</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2:381.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Cappadocia, Acacius of Caesarea, and Eunomius of Cyzicus.<sup>568</sup> That the opponents to the ‘homoousion’ went to such lengths to define the nature and role of the Holy Spirit is fascinating, given their difficulties with the Trinity. There was a current of Hellenistic thought that envisioned a Triad (cf. Plotinus), which provided context for those who drew their concepts from Hellenism. By contrast, this does not hold for those who drew their concepts from Scripture. For these writers who thought in Scriptural terms there was a current of thought that minimised the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Yet, what motivated their vigorous engagement in debate and elaborate descriptions of the Holy Spirit? To borrow a concept from fractal geometry – there was another *attractor* – the mind of the Church on the Holy Spirit.

For Athanasius and Basil, their engagement with these opponents over the key theological ideas of *unity of substance* and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit focused their own views on these ideas and sharpened their own arguments in support of them.

Hübner and Drecolt have described and tested methods of analysing texts for connections, with a view to mapping the flow of theological ideas in the formation of doctrine on the Holy Spirit. They began with charting the possible flow of ideas between protagonists in the late fourth-century discussions of the nature and role of the Holy Spirit. Following on the work of Hübner and Drecolt, this study has looked at the flow of theological ideas amongst both proponents *and* opponents, with the view that the engagement between them over the key theological ideas of *unity of substance* and the *divinity* of the Holy Spirit adds a useful dimension to their approaches.

### ***Further explorations***

Amongst those post-apostolic writers whom Basil did not include as witnesses, but who commented on the doxologies and liturgical formulae of the early

---

<sup>568</sup> Markus Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: Eine schrift gegen Asterius Von Kappadokien, Eusebius Von Cäsarea, Markell Von Ankyra und Photin Von Sirmium* (1996) 125-128, 380-385. See also Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J., *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (1999) 121-123, 182-209. See too Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (1867).



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Church and shed light on how it viewed the Holy Spirit, are Polycarp of Smyrna, Ignatius of Antioch and Tertullian.

Bishop Polycarp's doxology, which the Church of Smyrna recorded in the late 2<sup>nd</sup>-century letter that describes his martyrdom, gives his Eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving.

I bless thee for granting me this day and hour, that I may be numbered amongst the martyrs, to share the cup of thine Appointed and to rise again unto life everlasting, both in body and soul, in the immortality of the Holy Spirit. ...For this, and for all else besides, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee; through our eternal High Priest in Heaven, thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, by whom and with whom be glory to thee and the Holy Spirit, now and for all ages to come. Amen.<sup>569</sup>

The *Didache*, a guide to Christians on the 'Two Ways: a Way of Life and a Way of Death', dates to the latter half of the first century. In the second part of the *Didache* is a guide to Church practices. About baptism, the guide offers this:

The procedure for baptizing is as follows. After repeating all that has been said, immerse in running water 'In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit'.<sup>570</sup>

Further, the guide offers instructions regarding how to treat prophets and 'apostles' (teachers), 'While a prophet is uttering words in the spirit, you are on no account to subject him to any tests'.<sup>571</sup>

Early in the second century, Ignatius of Antioch describes in personal terms how the Holy Spirit works in his life and in the Church.<sup>572</sup> In his *Letter to the Philadelphians*, Ignatius in his greeting encourages the faithful to be loyal to

---

<sup>569</sup> Evarestus. *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Translated by Maxwell Staniforth. Pages 129-130 in *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Louth (1987). Regarding the dating of *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, several scholars have placed it in a range of dates from 155 through 177; for a summary of the discussion about the dating of *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, see *The Martyrdom* in *op. cit.*, 117-118.

<sup>570</sup> Anonymous. *Didache*. Translated by Maxwell Staniforth. Page 194 in *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Louth (1987). Prestige emphasizes that the baptismal formula mentioned in the *Didache* is true to the commission in the Gospel of St Matthew (Matt 28:19). Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 87.

<sup>571</sup> Anonymous, *Op. cit.*, 196.

<sup>572</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 154-156. It should be noted that some scholars question an early second century date.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

their bishop and clergy whose appointments have been ‘approved by Jesus Christ, and confirmed and ratified, according to His will, by His Holy Spirit’.<sup>573</sup> Ignatius reiterates this encouragement later in the same epistle, describing how the Holy Spirit spoke through him personally, ‘Thus, at the time I was with you, I cried out, speaking with a loud voice – the very voice of God – “Be loyal to your bishop and clergy and deacons”’.<sup>574</sup> Ignatius describes the Holy Spirit’s role in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, ‘...Under the Divine dispensation, Jesus Christ our God was conceived by Mary of the seed of David and of the Spirit of God; He was born, and He submitted to baptism, so that by His Passion He might sanctify water’.<sup>575</sup> Signally, Ignatius illustrates by way of a metaphor the Holy Spirit’s work in the Church to sanctify the faithful, ‘...stones trimmed ready for God to build with hoisted up by the derrick of Jesus Christ (the Cross) with the Holy Spirit for a cable; your faith being the winch that draws you to God, up the ramp of love’.<sup>576</sup>

Irenaeus of Lyons, who wrote later in the second century, teaches about the Holy Spirit. This teaching from Irenaeus clearly shows that in the second century, Christ’s commission to the Apostles, as given in *Matt* 28:19-20, forms the starting point for his view of the Holy Spirit. From there the Father fulfils His promise to pour the Holy Spirit upon the people whom His Son brings to Him and, beginning with the Apostles at Pentecost, the Comforter sanctifies and joins the people with their Lord.<sup>577</sup>

---

<sup>573</sup> Ignatius, *The Epistle to the Philadelphians*. Translated by Maxwell Staniforth. Page 93 in *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Louth (1987).

<sup>574</sup> Ignatius, *Op. cit.*, 95.

<sup>575</sup> Ignatius, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. Translated by Maxwell Staniforth. Page 66 in *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Louth (1987).

<sup>576</sup> Ignatius, *Op. cit.*, 63.

<sup>577</sup> ‘And...giving to the disciples the power of regeneration into God, He [Christ] said to them, ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost’. For God promised, that in the last times He would pour Him [the Spirit] upon [His] servants and handmaids, that they might prophesy; wherefore He did also descend upon the Son of God, ...This Spirit...descended at the day of Pentecost upon the disciples after the Lord’s ascension, having power to admit all nations to the entrance of life, and to the opening of the new covenant... Wherefore also the Lord promised to send the Comforter, who should join us to God. ...The Lord, receiving this [the Spirit] as a gift from His Father, does Himself confer it upon those who are partakers of Himself, sending the Holy Spirit upon all the earth.’ Irenaeus *Adversus haereses*. Translated by J.A. Robinson. Page 65 in *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A theological commentary and translation*. Edited by I. M. MacKenzie (2002).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Irenaeus presents a view in the development of more literal and concrete doctrine that derives from the Johannine tradition and continues with Tertullian to Methodius of Lycia late in the third century. In this view, the faith continues directly from the Scripture and Apostles, Scripture requires a literal interpretation, the soul and body originate together, the Holy Spirit inspires and sanctifies the believer, and the resurrection raises the physical body. For example, in the exegesis of the Apostle Paul's words in 1 *Cor* 15:50, Irenaeus counters the Gnostic view that resurrection does not include the physical body when he presents the view drawn from *John* 6:63 that the Spirit gives life and therefore those who receive the Spirit would rise again with renewed souls and bodies.<sup>578</sup> Tertullian takes this argument further in his *De resurrection mortuorum* when he counters the Gnostic depreciation of the material body with a celebration of its qualities.<sup>579</sup> This more concrete view stands over and against the more esoteric one of Origen, which this enquiry summarises later.

In Clement of Rome's first *Letter to the Corinthians*, singularly vivid markers for a divine Holy Spirit call out from the page, 'Why must there be all this quarrelling and bad blood, these feuds and dissensions among you? Have we not all the same God, and the same Christ? Is not the same Spirit of grace shed upon us all?',<sup>580</sup>

In this letter, Clement's final appeal for unity in the Corinthian Church again invokes the Holy Spirit.

Be counselled by us, and you will have nothing to regret. As surely as God lives, as Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit also (on whom are set the faith and hope of God's elect), so surely the man who keeps the divinely appointed decrees and statutes with humility and an unfailing consideration for others, and never looks back, will be

---

<sup>578</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 155-156. Robertson, *Prolegomena*, *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:xi-lxxxix.

<sup>579</sup> Kelly, *Op. cit.*, 164-165. For a classic discussion of the Montanists see Jaroslav Pelikan's paper on Montanism in which he finds: 'On the basis of the evidence considered thus far, it would be quite difficult to assign to Montanism any major significance in the evolution of the doctrine of the Trinity. Its main interests were not doctrinal but ethical...' 104; and '...Montanism made only a modest contribution to Tertullian's doctrine of the Trinity' 107. Jaroslav Pelikan, "Montanism and its Trinitarian Significance", *Church History*, 25 no. 2 (June 1956), 99-109.

<sup>580</sup> Clement, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*. Translated by Maxwell Staniforth. Page 42 in *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Louth (1987).

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

enrolled in honour among the number of those who are saved through Jesus Christ,...<sup>581</sup>

Clement concludes his appeal with another mention of the Holy Spirit.

So you will afford us great joy and happiness if you will lay to heart what we have written through the Holy Spirit, and will respond to the appeal for peace and harmony which we have made in this letter, by putting an end once for all to the rancours of an impious rivalry.<sup>582</sup>

Origen, the great Christian teacher of Alexandria, Egypt, and Caesarea Maritima (in the Levant), and one of the earliest speculative Christian philosophers, founds a view in which the deposit of faith is enriched by a 'speculative search'. Origen's theology can be summarized as an unfolding of the Son from Unity into Plurality in the economy of Salvation.<sup>583</sup> For Origen, the question of whether the Holy Spirit originates as 'ingenerate' *agennetos* like the Father or 'generate' *gennetos* like the Son or 'created' *genetá* was yet to be determined.<sup>584</sup>

In the mid-third century, Gregory Thaumaturgus, one of Origen's students and later bishop of Neo-Caesarea in Pontus, Asia Minor, reinforced the anti-Gnostic tone of creedal formulations with his expressions of faith.<sup>585</sup>

Methodius of Lycia, who wrote later in the third century, took exception to Origen's view that sanctification is a process of enlightenment (ethical) change, that is, a change of consciousness, which leads to resurrection of the metaphysical body.<sup>586</sup> On the subject of the Holy Spirit's work of sanctification, Methodius takes the tone of an ascetic, insisting on the purity of the believer in order to make a proper dwelling place for the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>581</sup> Clement, *Op. cit.*, 47.

<sup>582</sup> Clement, *Op. cit.*, 49.

<sup>583</sup> As Robertson describes Origen's theology, 'He [Origen] even explains the Unity of the Father and the Son as moral... The Son takes His place even in the cosmic process from Unity to Unity through Plurality, 'God is in every respect One and Simple, but the Saviour by reason of the Many becomes Many' (on *John* 1:22,...). The Spirit is subordinated to the Son, the Son to the Father..., while to the Spirit are subordinated created spirits, whose goodness is relative in comparison with God, and the fall of some of whom led to the creation of matter... Unlike the Son and the Spirit they are mutable in will...' Robertson, *Op. cit.*, xxv-xxvii.

<sup>584</sup> Prestige, *Op. cit.*, 140.

<sup>585</sup> Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Expos. fid.* (PG 10). Kelley, *Op. cit.*, 145.

<sup>586</sup> Shapland, *Op. cit.*, 39.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Also, there were limits to the terms with which to describe the personal being and relation of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. For example, there was no commonly understood term with which to convey the idea of ‘eternal procession’. Technical terms, especially those appropriated from Hellenistic philosophy, did not come into acceptance easily amongst Christian thinkers who clung to the letter of Scripture. Firstly, terms such as *homoousios* were tainted by philosophical use. Indeed, in the case of *homoousios*, the taint extended to its prohibition by the synod of Christian clergy that ejected Paul of Samosata from his Episcopal see in the year 269.<sup>587</sup> Secondly, these terms did not originate directly from Scripture, which prompted the proponents of such terms to offer support, often in the form of a test for Scriptural sense. Thirdly, such terms did not arrive to Christian thought with an immediately applicable meaning. So their meaning had to be shifted to apply to the new context. Finally, these terms, with their shifted meanings, gained acceptance and came into general use after proponents validated them for Scriptural sense to their colleagues.

In the action of the Holy Spirit, the speculative views differed only slightly, if vociferously, around how one invokes the Holy Spirit in baptism and the doxology, and in what is the goal of sanctification, whether resurrection is metaphysical or physical. The markers discussed in this enquiry point to a presupposition in the early Church that the Holy Spirit acts in these ways: participates in the incarnation of Christ, sanctifies the baptismal water and the Eucharistic bread and wine; inspires the prophets and teachers, moves believers to speak and understand in the Spirit, as the Comforter draws believers into harmony and union with God, as Advocate ratifies the teaching and even the selection of clergy.

The more dramatic divide between the theological views was around the personal being of the Holy Spirit – and what that meant to the Church. On the one hand, the Trinitarian view held that the Holy Spirit comes from God and by virtue of being in the Trinity enjoys equal glory, eternity and sovereignty with the Father and the Son. On the other, the homoian and anhomoian views share Origen’s uncertainty over the Holy Spirit’s origin in relation to God, but in any event, they

---

<sup>587</sup> Hanson, *Op. cit.*, 193-195. It should be noted that some scholars question this event and date.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

rank the Holy Spirit as subordinate and servile to the Son and the Father. The breadth and force of Origen's speculation around the personal being and action of the Son and Holy Spirit contributed in some measure to developments, especially at the hands of writers like Gregory Thaumaturgus and Methodius, that by the late third century led to the eclipse of Monarchianism in both its Sabellian and emanation-by-adoption modes, namely, Samosatene and anhomioian.<sup>588</sup>

The other influence that brought the Trinitarian view to ascendancy over those of the homoians and anhomioians was that early Christians held a presupposed belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>588</sup> Robertson, *Op. cit.*, xxvi-xxvii.

## ***Bibliography***

### ***Primary Sources:***

Apolinarius, 'Epistulae 362, 364', *PG* 32.

Asterius, 'Fragmente', in M. Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien: Die theologischen Fragmente. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XX. Edited by J. den Boeft, R. Van den Broek, A.F.J. Klijn, G. Quispel, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.

Athanasius of Alexandria, 'De Synodis', in P. Schaff and H. Wace (eds.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*, Second Series, vol. 4. (1886-1889). Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994, pp. 451-480.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Defence Against the Arians', in H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940, pp. 87-168.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Epistula LVI ad Jovianum', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Epistulae ad Serapionem I-III', in J.-P. Migne (ed.), *PG* 26, *Patrologia graeca (Patrologiae cursus completes: Series graeca)*, vol. 26, Paris: 1857-1886.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Expositio Fidei', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4, pp. 63-85.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Letters to Serapion', in Shapland, C. R. B. (ed.), *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. New York: NY: The Philosophical Library, Inc., 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Orationes Contra Arianos I-III', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Tomus ad Antiochenos', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4, pp. 481-486.

Basil of Caesarea, 'Contra Eunomium I-III', *PG* 29.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'De Spiritu Sancto', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 8, pp. 1-50.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Epistula 361', *PG* 32.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Homilia XXIV: Contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomoeos', *PG* 31.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Peri tou hagiou pneumatos (De Spiritu Sancto)', *PG* 32.

Clement, 'The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians' (M. Staniforth, tr.), in A. Louth (ed.), *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Eusebius of Caesarea, 'De ecclesiastica theologia III', in M. Vinzent and K. M. Spoerl, *Eusebius of Caesarea: Against Marcellus I-II, On Church Theology* (forthcoming publication).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'De ecclesiastica theologia III', in E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen (eds.), *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 4, 2nd edn. *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 14. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972.

Irenaeus of Lyons, 'Adversus haereses', *PG* 7.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Adversus haereses' (J. A. Robinson, tr.), in I. M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A theological commentary and translation*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002, p. 65.

Marcellus of Ancyra, 'Fragmente', in E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen (eds.), *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 4, 2nd edn. *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 14. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972, pp. 185-215.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Fragmente', in M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente der Brief an Julius von Rom. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XXXIX. Edited by J. den Boeft, R. Van den Broek, W.L. Petersen, D.T. Runia, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

Pseudo-Athanasius, 'In Librum Contra Sabellianos Monitum', *PG* 28.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Oratio quarta contra Arianos', in A. Stegmann (ed.), *Die pseudoathanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer' als "κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος" ein Apollinarisgut*. Rottenburg: Bader, 1917, pp. 43-87.

Pseudo-Basilus, 'Contra Eunomium IV and V', *PG* 31.

Socrates, 'Historia Ecclesiastica', in P. Maraval and P. Périchon (eds.), *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique* (Livres I-VII). Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004-2007.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Historia Ecclesiastica', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2.



## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Sozomenus, 'Historia Ecclesiastica', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 2.

'The Holy Creed', *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 14.

### ***Secondary Sources:***

Aland, K. et al., *The Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1983.

Anastos, M. V., 'Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίον, A Critical Analysis', in P. J. Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981, pp. 67-136.

Ayres, L., *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Bardy, G., *Recherches sur Lucien d'Antioche et son École*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1936.

Barnes, M. R. and Williams, D. H., *Arianism after Arius: essays on the development of the fourth century Trinitarian conflicts*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.

Beatrice, P. F., 'The Word "Homooousios" from Hellenism to Christianity,' *Church History* 71.2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 243-272.

Beeley, C. A., 'The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and present,' *Modern Theology* 26.1 (2010), pp. 90-119.

Brennecke, H. C., *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. : Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337-361)*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1984.

Congar, Y., *I believe in the Holy Spirit*. Translated by David Smith. 3 vols. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

Dörries, H., *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluß des [T]rinitarischen Dogmas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Drecol, V. H. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Fedwick, P. J. (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'A Chronology of Basil'. In P. J. Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981, pp. 3-19.

Hanson, R.P.C., 'Doctrine of Tradition in Relation to the Holy Spirit', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 22.4 (Dec., 1968), pp. 241-255.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*. London: T&T Clark, 2005, pp. 352-357.

Harnack, A. von, *History of Dogma*, Vols. II-IV. Edited by T. K. Cheyne. London: Williams & Norgate, 1896-1898.

Hübner, R. M., *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin: (Pseudo-Athanasius, contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Ps-Athanasius Contra Sabellianos: eine Schrift des Basilius oder des Apolinarius', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 41.4 (Dec., 1987), pp. 386-395.

Hübner, R. M. and Vinzent, M., *Der paradox Eine. Antignostischer Monarchianismus im Zweiten Jahrhundert*. In *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. L. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Creeds*. (1950. Repr.) London: Longman Group Limited, 2008.

Kinzig, W., *In search of Asterius : studies on the authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Kinzig, W. and Vinzent, M., 'Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed', *JTS* 50.2 (October 1999), pp. 535-559.

Lidell, H. G. and Scott, R., *A Lexicon: Abridged from Lidell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Lienhard, J. T., SJ, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 40. 4 (Dec., 1986), pp. 365-389.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Review of *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* By Reinhard M. Hübner', *Church History*, 59.4 (Dec., 1990), pp. 540-541.

Meredith, A., SJ, *The Cappadocians*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1995.

Mira Iborra, M., 'Drecol, Volker Henning, About the structure of *espiritu sancto* by Basil of Caesarea', *Studia patristica* vol 47. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 97-103.

Opitz, H. G., *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940, pp. 231-278.

Pelikan, J., *Christianity and Classical Culture: the Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. London: Yale University Press, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The "Spiritual Sense" of Scripture: The Exegetical Basis for St. Basil's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit'. In P. J. Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981, pp. 337-360.

Prestige, G. L., *God in Patristic Thought*. (1936. Repr.) Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, pp. 80-81.

\_\_\_\_\_, *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. Edited by H. Chadwick. London: S.P.C.K., 1956.

Riedmatten, H. de, 'La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée I u. II', *JThS*, N.S. 7 (1956), pp. 199-210; 8 (1957), pp. 53-70.

Robertson, A., 'Excursus', NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4, pp. 431-432.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Introduction to De Synodis', NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4, p. 448.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Prolegomena', NPNF<sup>2</sup> 4, pp. xi-lxxxix.

Rousseau, P., *Basil of Caesarea*. London: University of California Press, 1994.

Shapland, C. R. B. 'Introduction', in C. R. B. Shapland (ed.), *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. London: The Epworth Press, 1951, pp. 21-22.

## The Holy Spirit in the Fourth-Century Church

Stead, G. C., 'The Concept of Divine Substance', *Vigiliae Christianae* 29.1 (March 1975), pp. 1-14.

Swete, H. B., *On the Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. London: G. Bell, 1873.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1912.

Vinzent, M., *Asterius von Kappadokien: Die theologischen Fragmente. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XX. Edited by J. den Boeft, R. Van den Broek, A.F.J. Klijn, G. Quispel, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"', in *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis: studien zur sogenannten "Traditio Apostolica" zu den "Interrogationes de fide" und zum "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis"*, Begründet von Karl Holl† und Hans Lietzmann†, Band 74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999, pp. 185-409.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'From Zephyrinus to Damasus – What did Roman Bishops believe?', *SP* 63 (2013), pp. 273-86.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente der Brief an Julius von Rom. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XXXIX. Edited by J. den Boeft, R. Van den Broek, W.L. Petersen, D.T. Runia, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: Eine schrift gegen Asterius Von Kappadokien, Eusebius Von Cäsarea, Markell Von Ankyra und Photin Von Sirmium. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XXXVI. Edited by J. den Boeft, R. Van den Broek, A.F.J. Klijn, G. Quispel, J.C.M. van Winden. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996, pp. 125-128, 380-385.

Vinzent, M., and Spoerl, K. M., *Eusebius of Caesarea: Against Marcellus I-II, On Church Theology* (forthcoming publication).

Zahn, T., *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie*. Gotha: F.A. Perthes, 1867.

Zizioulas, J. D., *Being as Communion*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1985.